Metallurgical Analysis of Chinese Coins at the British Museum

Edited by Helen Wang Michael Cowell Joe Cribb Sheridan Bowman

British Museum Research Publication Number 152

Publishers

The British Museum Great Russell Street London WC1B 3DG

Series Editor Dr Josephine Turquet

Distributors

The British Museum Press 46 Bloomsbury Street London WC1B 3QQ

Metallurgical Analysis of Chinese Coins at the British Museum Edited by Helen Wang, Michael Cowell, Joe Cribb, Sheridan Bowman

© The Trustees of the British Museum 2005

Front cover: Coin tree of brass *Guangxu zhongbao* coins, Board of Revenue Mint, Beijing, China, Qing dynasty, *c*.AD 1905 (BM 1913-10-11-32).

ISBN 086159 152 6 ISSN 0142 4815

Note: the British Museum Occasional Papers series is now entitled British Museum Research Publications.The OP series runs from 1 to 150, and the RP series, keeping the same ISSN and ISBN preliminary numbers, begins at number 151.

For a complete catalogue of the full range of OPs and RPs see the series website: www/the britishmuseum.ac.uk/researchpublications or write to: Oxbow Books, Park End Place Oxford OX1 1HN, UK Tel: (+44) (0) 1865 241249 e-mail: oxbow@oxbowbooks.com website: www.oxbowbooks.com or The David Brown Book Co PO Box 511, Oakville CT 06779, USA Tel: (+1) 860 945 9329;Toll free 1 800 791 9354 e-mail: david.brown.bk.co@snet.net

Printed and bound in England by Kingswood Steele

Contents

Preface

The aim of this publication is to bring together the results of metallurgical analysis on Chinese coins undertaken at the British Museum during the last 15 years. The largest project looked at the metal content of Chinese cash coins over a period of more than 2,000 years. Although the results of the survey were summarised and published (Bowman, Cowell and Cribb, 1989), full details of the survey and photographs of the coins tested are presented here for the first time, along with an introduction by Joe Cribb and comments by Michael Cowell.

Since then, smaller metallurgical projects have been undertaken at the British Museum, looking at specific questions, such as the iron content of Song dynasty coins, the brass content of Qing dynasty coins, and the question of metal supply for Qing dynasty coins. The results of these projects are brought together here for ease of reference, and are presented in chronological order of the material examined.

We would like to thank our co-authors Yvonne Shashoua, formerly of the British Museum, and Michael Wayman, Professor of Metallurgy at the University of Alberta in

Edmonton, for their friendly co-operation, and the Royal Numismatic Society and the Historical Metallurgy Society for allowing us to reproduce the published articles here.

The analysis for the projects in this volume has been done at the British Museum, using coins from the British Museum collections. In the last decade, numismatists and scientists in China have also been looking at similar questions, using coins from archaeological sites. It is important that we share the results. Zhou Weirong's new book, *Chinese Coins: Alloy Composition and Metallurgical Research*, will be available soon, and we would like to thank him for agreeing to let us publish an English version of the introduction, postscript and contents pages of his book as an Appendix here.

Helen Wang and Joe Cribb, Department of Coins and Medals, the British Museum;

Michael Cowell and Sheridan Bowman, Department of Conservation, Documentation and Science, the British Museum

Introduction Joe Cribb

For over 2,000 years from the 3rd century bc until the second decade of the 20th century, the main official form of currency in China was the standard copper alloy coin.¹ Known as *quan, qian* or *wen* in Chinese, and by its pidgin name *cash* in English, this coin was characterised by its shape, round with a square hole, by its design, an inscription, and by its method of manufacture, cast from copper alloy in a mould. The longevity of this coin positions it as an important index of change in metallurgical practice through China's history. The steady export of these coins from the 7th century to Eastern Turkestan, Mongolia, Japan, Korea, Vietnam, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, India, the Persian Gulf, the Arabian Peninsula and East Africa, has also provided these regions with a supply of copper alloy.² Furthermore, in China and elsewhere these coins have been an important source of scrap metal for manufacturing utensils and images.

The purpose of the study on which this volume is based is to provide an overview of the use of copper alloys in the production of coins for more than 2,000 years, during which the cash dominated the currency systems of East Asia. The study of the copper alloy cash has also prompted examination of occasional issues of coins made from other base metals in China, including lead, zinc and iron.

The papers reprinted here represent a collaboration between the British Museum's Department of Coins and Medals and Department of Scientific Research (now part of the Department of Conservation, Documentation and Science). They set out the scientific principles and methods used in analysing and understanding the metals and alloys used in casting the coins. The papers focus on particular indications arising from the analyses, such as casting techniques, the introduction of brass using metallic zinc, the use of leaded bronzes, the import of copper from Japan and the medieval production of cast iron.

In September 1981, when the collaboration started, the decision was made to test at least two coins of each type (if available), to provide limited assurance of the result from individual coins. In some instances wider samples were tested, particularly to investigate specific points of interest. For periods when coins were issued with deliberately varying calligraphies, samples were chosen across the range of calligraphic styles to see if the function of the variation was to indicate metallurgical differences. In some instances contemporary issues from different mints or from different regions were analysed to see whether alloy standards were centralised.

The major results from this study are to be found in the papers presented here, but the results also suggest that other issues remain to be investigated arising from the full set of analyses. In one case, the comparison between Tang period coins made in China with those collected in Xinjiang (Chinese Central Asia), was made available to another scholar.³ The results showed that the production of both specific local issues and versions of centrally issued coins took place in Xinjiang and a more heavily leaded bronze was used in casting them.

The appearance of the first of these papers coincided with a project by Professors Dai Zhiqiang and Zhou Weirong of the Chinese Numismatic Museum, Beijing and Fan Xiangxi, a colleague from Beijing Teachers' University, who conducted a parallel series of analyses. Their results have largely corroborated those presented here, while calling on a broader range of Chinese textual sources to improve the understanding of the significance of the results.⁴ Their scientific methods were different: volumetric titration and atomic absorption spectrophotometry. The latter was also used by the British Museum Research Laboratory for some of its analyses, but X-ray fluorescence was the main method used.

The following are some general observations on the British Museum analyses, raising some issues which would benefit from further research and analyses being made.

Coins of the pre-Qin period (*c.* 350–221 BC)

Only round coins of the pre-Qin period were analysed at the British Museum, but their results are usefully compared with the analyses of knife- and hoe(spade)-shaped coins made by Dai and Zhou. The British Museum round coins show two different compositions: coins nos 1 and 2, inscribed *yuan*, are almost pure copper, but nos 3–6 are all made from the leaded bronze alloy which Dai and Zhou show was normally used to cast knife- and hoe-shaped coins.⁵ The round coins with leaded bronze are, however, alloyed with less lead than the so-called *ming* knife coins of the Yan State with which they are usually associated. The Yan knife-shaped coins analysed by Dai and Zhou mostly contain 40–60% lead.

Han to Sui dynasties (206 BC – AD 618)

The Han period *banliang* coins represent three different issues, *c.* 200 bc (nos 11–14),*c.* 175 bc (nos 15–18) and *c.* 150 bc (nos 19–22). The first two issues were made with the same leaded bronze of inconsistent quality as the pre-Qin coins (nos 3–6), but mostly with a higher tin content, whereas the last issue is, like the *yuan* coins (nos 1–2), of almost pure copper. Both the *yuan* coins and the 150 bc *banliang* coins contain traces of lead, tin and iron, consistent with them being made from the first refining of copper ores, suggesting that they were probably made close to the mines from which the ore was extracted. A distinctive characteristic of these coins is that the small amount of iron in them renders the coins susceptible to a magnet.⁶ A similar phenomenon has been observed in 1st century bc and 1st century AD coins from ancient Kashmir, probably because these were also made close to the sources of copper ores.⁷

Coins issued by Wang Mang show a similar leaded bronze alloy to the early Han *banliang* coins, but in most cases with a

Cribb

higher copper content (80–95%). The *huoquan* examples are of two varieties (distinguished by the treatment of the central hole). The two specimens with a dotted upper rim to the hole (nos 25 and 26) show a lower copper content (70–80%) than the other two (nos 23 and 24) with a rimmed hole (80–95%). This may indicate different mints or different dates of issue. The *daquan wushi* coins (nos 27–32) are close in alloy to the latter pair (nos 23 and 24) with higher copper content, even though their varied sizes suggest different dates of production. The coins inscribed *xiaoquan zhiyi* (nos 33 and 34) are of a lower copper content, like the dotted rim *huoquan* coins (nos 25 and 26).

Although the Western Han *wuzhu* coins (nos 35–38) show similar differentiation marks to the Wang Mang *huoquan* coins (nos 23–26) they all seem to be of a consistently high copper leaded bronze, like most of the Wang Mang coins tested. One *wuzhu* coin (no. 39) normally attributed to the Western Han because of its marked corners, however, shows a lower copper content more consistent with that of the Eastern Han *wuzhu* coins (nos 40–41) also with four projections, but on the back. The other two Eastern Han *wuzhu* coins show the same higher copper content as the Western Han coins. The variation of quality and markings on the coins suggests that the markings might have been added to indicate the change in quality of the alloy. More extensive sampling of the series would help to clarify the significance of this. The examples analysed by Zhou and Dai represent an early group of Western Han *wuzhu* issued *c.* 118 bc, which show a range (71–88%), which overlaps both the higher (80–95%) and the lower copper (70–80%) leaded bronzes as observed in the British Museum analyses, and a group of Wang Mang coins all made from the higher copper alloy (82–86%).

Two tiny versions of the *wuzhu* coinage, attributable to the late Western Han period show a widely disparate copper content. The varying quality of the two examples tested suggests that no. 45 has the higher copper content of the other Western Han wuzhu coins tested (nos. 35–38), but no. 44 is of such a low quality that it could be an unofficial copy of the period.

The coins of the local dynasties following the end of the Han period show a general adherence to the lower copper content leaded bronze of the Eastern Han period, with all specimens falling within, or close to, the range 70–80% copper.

Tang dynasty (AD 618–907)

Three groups of Tang coins have been analysed, all showing the same leaded bronze alloy of varying proportions as used earlier.

The first group are the typical *Kaiyuan tongbao* coins introduced at the beginning of the dynasty and continuing to be issued until its demise. These were selected to show the range of styles, additional marks and sizes. They show a lack of consistency in the copper content of the leaded bronze alloy used throughout the Tang period, with a range of 67–94%. The coins were selected in pairs, but even these show the same lack of consistency (nos 64 and 65: 67–94%; nos 68 and 69: 68–78%). A larger sample would show if the selected pieces are typical or exceptional. Two token coins (nos $76-77$) issued in AD 666, when *Kaiyuan tongbao* coins were still in regular production, show copper contents in the higher part of the range of the *Kaiyuan tongbao* coins.

The second group come from the middle of the Tang period. A token issue, inscribed *Qianyuan zhongbao*, was introduced in AD 759 which went through various stages of reduction in

weight. Remarkably, the largest examples tested (nos 78–80) are well below (36–52%) the normal range of copper content recorded for the early Tang issues. One example (no. 81) had the appearance of a brass copy and testing showed a significantly high zinc content, suggesting that it was probably made in the late Qing period (19th century) for collectors. The standard size tokens (nos 82–85) show two distinct copper contents. Three examples (nos 82, 83 and 85) have a consistent copper content in the range 65–68%, but the fourth piece (no. 84) has only 6.8% copper. This example was collected in Xinjiang by Rudolf Hoernle (1841–1918) and was probably made in that region. One of the good quality pieces (no. 85) was also collected in Xinjiang, but its copper content suggests that it was imported into the region from China. Examples showing two stages of reduction in size and weight of the standard token have been tested. Again they show two different ranges of copper content. Most of the examples are within the range 75–79%, slightly higher than the full size tokens. Two examples fall just below this (nos 92 and 93), with a range of 59–64% copper content. These have a smaller inscription than the others and are perhaps intentionally lower in quality. They also show a slightly higher iron content than the other examples. The last two examples (nos 94 and 95), which were collected in Xinjiang, have an even lower copper content (25–44%); they are also the smallest and lightest examples tested. Their low copper content, like that of no. 84, suggests that they were local products. This is supported by the *Dali yuanbao* coins (nos 96 and 97) which were issued in AD 769 only in Xinjiang. They also show the same lower copper content, with the tested examples, collected in the region, showing a range of 37-49%, well below the normal Tang period range.⁸

The third group (nos 98–143) are all issues of the late Tang period, a series of locally produced *Kaiyuan tongbao* coins from mints all over China, made in AD 845 following an order to produce coins. Although the coins were made at 23 different mints with a variety of versions of the *Kaiyuan tongbao* calligraphy, they show a remarkable consistency, with most examples within the range 70–80% copper.

Coins of the rebellion against the Tang in AD 759 (nos 144–145) have the same type of alloy as the standard token coins of the same period issued by the Tang emperor (nos 78–85).

Five dynasties – Ten Kingdoms period (AD 907–979)

The standard used in the late Tang, 70-80% copper in a leaded bronze of varying proportions, continued to be used in the period of fragmentation following the Tang dynasty. The 13 Southern Tang coins (nos 164–176) are mostly in the lower half of this range showing a tighter standard of 66–74%, while the 12 Former and Later Shu coins (nos 152–163) are mostly in the upper half with a standard of 75–83%. These differences suggest that slightly different standards for copper content were being used in different regions during this period.

In some regions lead or iron coins were issued, perhaps as a consequence of the many conflicts arising during the period leading to economic crises. Some lead coins of the Southern Han were tested and found to be of pure lead (nos 179–185).

Song, Jin and Yuan dynasties (AD 960–1368)

Leaded bronze continued to be the usual alloy used to make coins during the Song period, but in some areas iron coinage became normal, replacing bronze. This reflected an attempt to

deal with the dwindling supply of copper as the export of coins became a large-scale activity. Some areas close to the northern Liao, Xi Xia and Jin dynasties used iron coinage as an attempt to create a barrier to the export of bronze coins into the territories of these dynasties.

Before about 1068 the copper content of the leaded bronze was mostly within the range 66–77%, but after that it fell slightly to a lower range 63–73%. In 1127 the Song dynasty lost northern China to the Jin dynasty and consequently lost some of its copper sources. This led to a continuing decline in standards with a widening range of copper content, most coins falling within the range 56–73%.

The analyses published by Dai and Zhou show a similar falling standard in the Song period with a range of 62–68% during the early Song period dropping to 50–60% after the loss of the northern territories, although their sample is much smaller (one coin for each of the 20 reign periods down to 1127 and 20 coins for 14 reign periods for the later period).

Some of the coins with Song dynasty reign period inscriptions are non-Chinese products, copied in Vietnam and Japan, where imported Chinese coins were in circulation. Numbers 245 and 246 are Vietnamese issues of a later date, showing a higher lead content than their Chinese prototypes.⁹ Numbers 214 and 215 can also be attributed to Vietnam and have a lead content in the upper range of that of the Chinese issues, but their relatively low tin content suggests that they might not be issued in the same context as nos 245 and 246.¹⁰ Numbers 311, $312, 315, 316,$ and $349-351$ are probably Japanese products.¹¹ The first four all show a much lower tin content than their Chinese prototypes, but the last three are well within the normal range of the alloy of their Chinese prototype (except the high iron content of no. 349).

Two Jin dynasty (nos 412 and 413) and four Yuan dynasty coins (nos 415–418) were tested and all showed a higher copper content than the Song period coins, with a range of 71–83%.

Ming dynasty (AD 1368–1644)

The higher standard used by the Yuan dynasty seems to have been maintained by the early Ming emperors, but at first with a narrower range 70–78%, then rising to a range of 70–87% in the Hongzhi reign period (issued 1503-5). The coins of the Hongzhi reign period (nos 434–452) cannot be arranged chronologically, but the variations observed in quality could represent a changing standard. There is also an increased amount of zinc noticeable in the coins, with half of them showing above 1%. Two *Hongzhi tongbao* coins (nos 451 and 452) show an even higher zinc content, sufficient to suggest that the zinc was intentionally present. The work of Dai and Zhou has demonstrated that the early use of zinc in coinage used the cementation method, i.e. adding zinc ore to molten copper. In the case of these two coins it seems to have been added to the usual leaded bronze alloy. The copper, tin and lead are proportionately reduced by the addition of zinc, so that the copper content is in the range 66–69%.

The next issue of coins after 1503 was delayed until the Jiajing reign period (1527–1570). The use of zinc ore in coin production now became normal. Before the Wanli reign period (1576–1621), the zinc ore was normally added to the usual leaded bronze alloy, but during that reign some coins show so little tin (nos 465, 469 and 470) that the alloy can be considered to be brass. The amount of zinc also increased during the same period with a range of 7–33%. The high levels of zinc suggested to Cowell that zinc metal was being added to the alloy, but Dai and Zhou have shown from textual sources that zinc ore was being added until 1621.¹² After that date, tin levels are consistently below 1% and zinc levels rise in some cases to 40% as zinc was now being added to the alloy in metallic form.

Qing dynasty (AD 1644–1911)

The brass alloys of the Qing period have been discussed at length in the papers in this volume and by Hartill.¹³ It is interesting to note the low zinc coins of the Yunnan mint before 1722. Yunnan was a main source of copper for the Qing dynasty and therefore seems to have made less use of zinc before it complied to the official standard being used in Beijing.

Notes

- 1 For a detailed account of Chinese coinage from its origins to the 20th century, see Peng Xinwei, *Zhongguo Huobi Shi* (Shanghai, 3rd edn, 1965), also trans. into English by E. Kaplan, *A Monetary History of China*, 2 vols (Bellingham WA, 1994).
- See J. Cribb and D. Potts, 'Chinese coin finds from Arabia and the Arabian Gulf', *Arabian Archaeology and Epigraphy* (1996), 108–18; and J. Cribb, 'Chinese coin finds from South India and Sri Lanka', in K.K. Maheshwari and B. Rath (eds), *Numismatic Panorama, Essays in Memory of late Shri S. M. Shukla* (New Delhi, 1996), 253–69.
- 3 See N. Rhodes, 'Tang dynasty coins made in Xinjiang', in K. Tanabe, J. Cribb and H. Wang (eds), *Studies in Silk Road Coins and Culture* (Kamakura, 1997), 181–86.
- See Dai Zhiqiang and Zhou Weirong, 'Studies in the alloy composition of past dynasties copper coins in China', in M. Hoc (ed.), *Proceedings of the XIth International Numismatic Congress, Brussels, 1991* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1993), vol. 2, 311–24; Zhou Weirong and Fan Xiangxi, 'A study on the development of brass for coinage in China', *Bulletin of the Metals Museum* (Aoba, Sendai, Japan,1993), vol. 20, II, 35–45.
- 5 Dai Zhiqiang and Zhou Weirong, 'Studies'.
- 6 Cowell provided me with this explanation of the magnetic responsiveness of the impure copper used to make these coins.
- 7 B.K. Tanner, D.W. MacDowall, I.B. MacCormack and R.L. Smith, 'Ferromagnetism in ancient copper-based coinage', *Nature* 280 (1979), 46–48, based on similar magnetic responsiveness in Kushan coins originally observed by the late John Nisbet.
- 8 Rhodes, 'Tang dynasty coins'.
- 9 Nos 245 and 246 have the stylistic (small seal script) and casting technique (thin flan with broad rims on reverse) attributes of Vietnamese copies of Chinese coins. Parallels to them can be seen in F. Thierry, *Catalogue des monnaies vietnamiennes* (Paris, 1987), no. 105, and, Miura Gosen, *Annan Senpu*, (Catalogue of Vietnamese Coins), 3 vols (Tokyo, 1963), vol. 1, 81, no. 2 and 86, no. 4.
- 10 Nos 214 and 215 are attributed to Vietnam by Thierry, *Catalogue*, no. 1129, and Miura, *Annan Senpu*, vol. 1, 20, no. 3. Thierry identifies them as Vietnamese copies of Japanese copies of Chinese coins. The Japanese prototypes were made in Nagasaki *c*. 1659–1685.
- 11 Nos 311, 312, 315, 316 and 349–351 belong to the series of Japanese issues made in imitation of Chinese coins. Nos 311, 312 and 315 are attributed to the mint of Nagasaki 1659–1685, Japan by the Bank of Japan, Research Department, *Zuroku Nihon no Kahei* (Illustrated Japanese Money), (Tokyo, 1972), vol. 4, no. 313. Nos 315 and 316 and 349–351 are earlier privately minted imitations in the series known by Japanese scholars as *bita-sen* and *shima-sen*. Each example of *bita-sen* and *shima-sen* series is different, so it is not possible to refer to exact parallels, but examples of the series are to be found in Bank of Japan, *Zuroku Nihon no Kahei*, vol. 1, *bita-sen* nos 354–445, *shimasen* nos 446–538.
- 12 Dai and Zhou were able to dispute Cowell's original interpretation of the evidence relating to the introduction of zinc; see 'Studies'. Cowell argued for the use of metallic zinc from the beginning of brass coinage in China, but Dai and Zhou were able to show, both from texts and the variation of trace elements that Chinese brass was initially made using zinc ore and only later was metallic zinc used. 13 See D. Hartill, *Qing Cash,*Royal Numismatic Society Special
- Publication 37 (London, 2003).

Two Thousand Years of Coinage in China: An Analytical Survey Sheridan Bowman, Michael Cowell and Joe Cribb

Introduction

The primary aim of this project was to provide an analytical survey of dated copper-based Chinese cast metalwork. The potential of coinage for this purpose is obvious and, in the case of China, made particularly opportune by the long tradition of manufacture of the copper-alloy cash coin. For almost two millenia the Chinese used this copper-based unit as virtually their only official coinage for day-to-day use. For much of this time the style and method of production of the cash remained essentially unchanged.¹ Unlike the majority of Western coinages it was cast in its final form, instead of being struck, and this practice continued right up to the early 20th century.

The production methods used for cash manufacture were very conservative. We have a full account of the 17th century practice,² but much the same process had been used since the Han dynasty (2nd century bc). The coins were cast in large numbers in batches in two-piece moulds arranged vertically. Moulds were prepared from fine sand re-inforced with an organic binder and contained within a wooden box. A pattern of 50-100 'mother cash' (either individually made or identical copies of a single master cash) were pressed lightly into the surface and then a second mould box was placed face down on top. An impression was thus taken of both sides of the mother cash pattern. The mould boxes were then turned over and separated so that the mother cash remained on the lower mould surface. A fresh mould box was then laid on this and again the pair turned and separated. In this way a series of two-piece moulds were obtained. After clearing channels between the coin impressions and making a central runnel, the boxes were fixed together in pairs and, following a preliminary firing, metal was poured in. The result was a 'cash tree' from which the coins were separated and subsequently cleaned up. A few fragmentary and complete cash trees have survived. The one illustrated here (**Fig. 1 see cover**) although dating from the mid-19th century is typical of earlier examples.

In principle, the intention of this analytical survey was that the coins should merely provide a convenient dated series of metalwork. However, it has also been possible to use the analytical data to corroborate the numismatic study of the series, particularly the chronology of some of the later issues. There have been several recent analytical studies including Chinese coins,³ but they were restricted to comparatively short periods and no complete survey can be established from them.

There are a number of reasons why such a dated survey of metalwork would be of interest. One of these concerns the possible early use of more exotic metals and alloys some of which are alluded to in Chinese texts. For example, it has been suggested that the early use of cupro-nickel by the Indo-Greeks in Bactria during the 2nd century bc was initiated by trade contacts with the Chinese,⁴ although this was refuted by Cammann.⁵ A more recent technical study of the Bactrian

coinage provides data that are also opposed to the introduction of the alloy from China.⁶ Nevertheless, one of the reasons for suggesting a Chinese origin for cupro-nickel was the availability of suitable ores in south-west China. These were certainly exploited from the 16th century AD for the manufacture of 'paktong', a copper-nickel-zinc alloy, which was later widely copied in the west. Chinese texts suggest that it was known much earlier than this and possibly used for the casting of coins.⁷ However, there are no verifiable analyses to support this. Clearly, it would be useful for a more systematic survey of the coinage to establish whether or not nickel was a substantial component of typical early Chinese copper alloys.

Further interest centres around the manufacture of metallic zinc by the Chinese. Needham has traced references to alloys that are presumed to contain zinc back to the 2nd century bc with retrospective accounts possibly referring to the individual metal in the 9th or 10th century AD.⁸ However, there is no definite evidence for the isolation of metallic zinc by the Chinese until the early 17th century AD.⁹ There are reported analyses of 2nd century bc Han dynasty coins containing several percent of zinc,¹⁰ but the authenticity of these coins cannot now be confirmed. Although the concentration of zinc in these coins is no higher than that which could be achieved by the cementation process, this would be early evidence for the use of the process in the East and worthy of further investigation. The zinc coins analysed by Leeds which were thought to have been minted from the 15th century onwards are now believed to be oriental imitations made outside China in the 17th century at the earliest and possibly the 18th or 19th century.¹¹ During the late Ming and Qing dynasties there is well documented use of brass for the cash coinage but it is not clear to what extent cementation brass and metallic zinc contributed towards its manufacture. It would be of interest to know precisely when the introduction of brass took place and if it is possible to identify the earliest use of metallic zinc in its formulation.

Finally, a systematic survey of dated Chinese metalwork, not generally available in the West, would be useful information on the typical composition of casting alloys. This is not to imply that a database of coin analyses could be used to 'date' other Chinese metalwork but it would provide a useful framework for comparative studies.

Analytical techniques

Obviously, for a meaningful survey over such a long period of time, a large number of analyses are required to ensure that the data are representative. Since, in the first instance, the major alloying components were of principal interest rather than trace elements a rapid technique was required with moderate sensitivity. X-ray fluorescence (XRF) was therefore used as the principal analytical technique for all the coins but atomic absorption was subsequently applied to selected pieces to

Bowman, Cowell and Cribb

support the XRF data and extend the range of elements quantified. A Link Systems model 290 XRF spectrometer was used with a tungsten-target X-ray tube operated at 40 kV. A suitable area on the rim of each coin was normally selected for analysis and either scraped with a scalpel or abraded with silicon carbide paper to remove surface deposits of corrosion. Copper, tin, zinc, iron and lead were quantified in all coins and a selection were also analysed for nickel, antimony, silver and arsenic. The atomic absorption (AAS) analyses were carried out using a Pye Unicam SP9 spectrometer following the procedure described by Hughes *et al.* for copper-based alloys.¹² Fourteen major, minor and trace elements were quantified. Samples for AAS were taken by drilling into the edge of each coin with a 0.75mm drill bit and removing about 10mg of metal.

The limitations of XRF for the surface analysis of copperbased, particularly leaded, alloys have been noted,¹³ and segregation of lead in Chinese coins has been found by Sano and Tominaga.¹⁴ It was expected therefore that the accuracy of the results using this procedure would be compromised somewhat by inhomogeneities of the alloy. Replicate analysis and comparisons between XRF and AAS results on typical, not heavily corroded, coins indicate that the lead concentration will be subject to the greatest errors, typically \pm 10–15% relative as opposed to 5–10% relative for tin and zinc. This variation is less than the differences found between some of the coin groups and was considered acceptable for the purposes of this survey.

Results

General trends

About 550 coins have been analysed in this survey covering a period from the Zhou dynasty, the 3rd century bc, to the end of the Qing dynasty in the late 19th century AD. The coins were selected to provide as representative a spread of dates as possible. However, there are some periods when issues of coinage were severely restricted or curtailed completely, for example during parts of the 14th and 15th centuries, so that a complete coverage was not possible. During the period surveyed a number of mints were in operation throughout China which may not have always adhered to central minting policy. The investigation of possible regional variations in composition has yet to be examined however since the majority of the later coins included in the survey were selected from those attributed to or representative of the central mint at Beijing.

The results show that, in general, issues before the 16th century are leaded bronze whereas subsequently they are brass. The general trends in the composition of the bronze coins are summarised in **Figures 2 and 3** which display the average typical concentrations of lead and tin in the alloy (with bars indicating 1 standard deviation) for periods of a century or individual dynasties. It can be seen that for much of the period covered the coinage is heavily leaded bronze which is of course particularly suitable for cast metalwork. The lead content is typically in the range 10–40% and the tin content ranges up to about 16%. Although there are comparatively wide ranges in composition for coins issued over short periods, when these are averaged, some longer term trends become apparent. For example, prior to the end of the Tang dynasty in the 9th century AD there is a progressive increase in the amount of tin in the alloy but the lead content is rather erratic. After the Tang

dynasty the overall trend is for the tin content to decline, except for one or two discontinuities. It is noticeable that during this period the trend in lead content is the oposite of that for tin, with the lead increasing at the expense of the tin and the copper. The progressive increase in the lead content may be related to the state of the Chinese economy because by adding lead there would be a saving in the more expensive copper and tin. It is significant that during the Song dynasty, when there are known to have been shortages of copper and greater demands on the coinage,¹⁵ the increase in the lead content is most pronounced.

The survey has also identified the point at which the coinage alloy changed from leaded bronze to brass, or more accurately a quaternary alloy containing substantial amounts of zinc, tin and lead. This change occurred during the years 1503 to 1505. The compositions of the coins during this critical phase are listed below in **Table 1** together with the subsequent issues to 1566. Unfortunately only date ranges can be given for some of the coins in this table because the issues cannot as yet be more precisely dated. In addition, no coins seem to have been issued in the period 1505 to 1527 probably because of attempts to introduce a paper currency.¹⁶

The results in **Table 1** have been ordered to group together the brass issues and also to indicate an apparent trend in the composition of the bronze issues. The latter have been ordered by decreasing lead to tin ratio but the numismatic significance of this has yet to be investigated. Out of the 19 coins analysed that were issued during 1503–05, 2 (550 and 548) contain substantial amounts of zinc whereas most of the remainder are leaded bronze. All the coins examined with dates after 1527 are made of brass. The complete establishment of brass over leaded bronze for the cash coinage by 1527 is in accordance with near contemporary records such as those by Gu Ziyu [Ku Tsu-yu] in 1667, who notes that brass coins were used from 1520 onwards.¹⁷

Table 1 Composition of coins issued during the transition from bronze to brass

* Analyses by AAS, remainder by XRF

Bowman, Cowell and Cribb

Prior to the 16th century zinc occurs only as a trace component of the alloy, generally less than 1%. This is a concentration which could have arisen through fortuitous association with copper or lead ores. The few exceptions proved on detailed examination to be of uncertain authenticity because of incorrect style, artificial patination or absence of internal corrosion.

The nickel contents were found to be similarly low and none was greater than 0.5%. Certainly no early cupro-nickel was identified and even during the late Ming and Qing dynasties, when paktong was definitely being manufactured, nickel was never other than a trace contaminant of the coinage.

Brass coinage

The primary source of contemporary information on the manufacture of the Chinese brass coinage is the *Tian gong kai wu* [*T'ien-kung K'ai-wu*] written about 1637.¹⁸ This gives precise details of the alloy used for the coinage, the method of casting and the preparation of the coins afterwards. The procedure referred to speaks of six or seven parts of copper alloyed with three or four parts of zinc, noting that about a quarter of the zinc is usually lost through vaporisation. Zinc was then regarded as a very cheap metal known as *wu qian* [*wo chienn*] or poor lead and took the place of lead in effectively reducing the amount of copper in the alloy. In consequence, contemporary forgeries were reported to contain the most zinc with up to 50% of the metal. Clearly metallic zinc was available in the East at this time in substantial quantities and it is well known to have been exported to Europe at the beginning of the 17th century.¹⁹ In fact, the current results show that the brass coinage in China can definitely be traced back over 100 years before this. What indication is there for the use of metallic zinc, as opposed to cementation brass, over this period? As we will show, the analytical data provide strong evidence for the availability of metallic zinc in China from the first quarter of the 16th century.

The main alloy composition of the brass coins issued from the 16th century to mid-18th century are summarised in **Figure 4** by the means and ranges for zinc, tin and lead. This shows that the zinc content was initially only about 13–16% but, apart from some fluctuations, soon reached over 20%, and then by the early 17th century was 30–40%, which corresponds to the contemporary accounts. After the early 17th century the zinc content is occasionally reduced but not, it seems, below 20%. The wide, and apparently random, range in the zinc concentration over certain periods has some numismatic and historical significance which will not be explored in this paper. In addition to zinc the alloy also contained, at various times, substantial amounts of tin and lead, often totally 15–20%, whose concentrations are usually inversely correlated with the zinc. The presence of these metals is almost certainly connected with the use of re-cycled scrap, the possible inclusion of which is mentioned by Song Yingxing [Sung Ying-Hsing].²⁰ In this context, it is significant that the tin and lead concentrations are highest in the earliest brass issues, with their relative proportions being similar to that in the near contemporary leaded bronze coins (see also **Table 1**). There would have been substantial amounts of earlier leaded bronze coinage available at that time and it would have been uneconomical to have refined this in order to extract the more valuable copper and tin components.

The concentrations of tin and lead in the early brass coins suggests that at least half of the metal used derived from recycled bronze. It may be conjectured that the zinc in these same coins was introduced via cementation brass which could have had a maximum zinc concentration in the range 28–33%. However, after dilution with at least an equal weight of scrap bronze (in some cases perhaps twice as much), the zinc concentration of the final alloy could not then be as high as that actually found in most of the coins. Hence, it seems more likely to the authors that zinc metal was added to the alloy in appropriate quantities and this applies even to the earliest brass issues in the period 1503–05. There may also be some historical evidence for the addition of zinc in that a different metal (described as 'good' or 'superior tin') was added to some of the issues of the Hongzhi period ($1488-1505$) in the year 1505,²¹ which is precisely the date of the first brass issues discovered here. If correctly interpreted, the original reference indicates that the amount of zinc added would have been about 12.5% which is similar to that found in the coins.

Summary

This survey has shown that the Chinese cash was usually manufactured from leaded bronze until the 16th century. Then, sometime during the period 1503–05, brass coinage was introduced, perhaps alongside that of bronze, until from 1527 onwards all subsequent issues were made of brass. The composition of these brass issues indicates that metallic zinc was used in their manufacture, rather than cementation brass, and hence that zinc metal was available to the Chinese early in the 16th century. Whether this was manufactured in China or imported, perhaps from India, cannot be determined from these data but certainly it must have been available in considerable quantities. The composition of the coinage provides no evidence of early brass production using the cementation process although this does not guarantee that it was not used for other metalwork. Indeed, before the brass coinage was introduced, there is abundant evidence of brass of probable cementation origin being used for statuary metalwork in China.²²

[First published in *The Journal of the Historical Metallurgy Society* 23 (1989), 25–30.]

Notes

- 1 W. Burger, *Ch'ing Cash until 1735* (Taipei, 1976).
- 2 Song Yingxing [Sung Ying-Hsing], *Tian gong kai wu* (1637), see trans. by E-Tu Zen Sun and Shiou-Chuan Sun, *Chinese Technology in the Seventeenth Century*, (Pennsylvania, 1966), 165–69.
- 3 H. Mabuchi, S. Yamaguchi, H. Kanno, T. Nakai, 'Chemical analysis of ancient oriental coins by atomic absorption spectrometry', *Scientific Papers on Japanese Antiques and Art Craft*s 22 (1978), 20–23. H. Mabuchi, K. Notsu, S. Nishimatsu, K. Fuwa, H. Iyam and T. Tominaga, 'Chemical compositions of ancient coins', *Nippon Kagaku Kaishi*, 1979(5), 586–90. K. Notsu and H. Mabuchi, 'Simultaneous multielement analysis of coins by inductively coupled plasma emission spectrometry', *Proceedings 2nd International Symposium on Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Property* (1979), 111–24. Y. Sano, K. Notsu and T. Tominaga, 'Studies on chemical composition of ancient coins by multivariate analysis', *Scientific Papers on Japanese Antiques and Art Crafts* 28 (1983), 44–58. Dai Zhiqiang and Wang Tihong, 'Bei Song tongqian jinshu chengfen shixi' ['A trial analysis of the metal content of the cash of the Northern Song dynasty', *China Numismatics*], *Zhongguo Qianbi*1985(3), 7–16. 4 C. F. Cheng and C.M. Schwitter, 'Nickel in ancient bronzes', *American*
- *Journal of Archaeology* 61 (1957), 351–65.

Two Thousand Years of Coinage in China: An Analytical Survey

- 5 S.W.R. Cammann, 'The Bactrian nickel theory', *American Journal of Archaeology* 62 (1958), 409–14.
- 6 M.R. Cowell, 'Analyses of the cupro-nickel alloy used for Greek Bactrian coins', *Proceedings of the 25th Archaeometry Conference* $(Athens, 1986)$
- 7 J. Needham, *Science and Civilisation in China*, V: 2 (Cambridge, 1974), 231.
- 8 Needham, *Science and Civilisation*, 219.
- 9 Song Yingxing [Sung Ying-Hsing], *Chinese Technology*.
- 10 Chang Hung-Chao, 'Lapidarium Sinicum: a study of the rocks, fossils and minerals as known in Chinese literature', *Memoirs of the Chinese Geological Survey* (series B), 1927, no. 2 (Peiping).
- 11 E.T. Leeds, 'Zinc coins in mediaeval China', *Numismatic Chronicle* 14 (1955), 177.
- 12 M.J. Hughes, M.R. Cowell and P.T. Craddock, 'Atomic absorption techniques in archaeology', *Archaeometry* 18 (1976), 19–37.
- 13. W. Oddy, S. La Niece and N. Stratford, *Romanesque Metalwork*(London, 1986).
- 14 Y. Sano and T. Tominaga, 'Segregration of elements in ancient Chinese coinage', *Scientific Papers on Japanese Antiques and Art Crafts* 27 (1982), 12–17.
- 15 Yang Lien-sheng, *Money and Credit in China* (Cambridge, Mass., 1052).
- 16 R. Huang, *Taxation and Governmental Finance in Sixteenth Century Ming China* (Cambridge, 1974).
- 17 Needham, *Science and Civilisation*, 208.
- 18 Sung Ying-Hsing, *Chinese Technology*.
- 19 A. Bonnin, *Tutenag and Paktong; with Notes on Other Alloys in Domestic Use During the 18th Century* (Oxford, 1924).
- 20 Song Yingxing [Sung Ying-Hsing], *Chinese Technology*, 169.
- 21 O.Y. Tsai, *Zhongguo guquan jianghua* (Taipei, 1973). [An account of ancient Chinese coins].
- 22 G. Beguin and L. Liszak-Hours, 'Objets Himalayens en metal', *Annales du Laboratoire de Recherche des Musées de France* (1982), 28–82.

Comments by Michael Cowell (2003)

The analytical project carried out in 1989, which included some 550 cash coins, was the most extensive analytical survey of Chinese copper-alloy coinage then published in the West. Prior to that, many analyses had been published in China and Japan, but these did not cover the complete period surveyed here.¹ However, at about the same time, and subsequently, there were many more analyses of this coinage being carried out in China, particularly by Zhou Weirong and colleagues,² that covered a similar period; their results are essentially compatible with ours.

The primary objective of the British Museum project was to provide analyses of representative coins over most of the period of cash production, thereby providing a general database of Chinese cast copper-based metal composition. It was intended that this could be used for comparison with other cast metalwork, such as statuary, and allowed periods of significant

composition change to be identified for more detailed investigation, such as the introduction of zinc-containing alloys. To carry out the survey in a reasonable time, a relatively rapid technique was used for the majority of the analyses, X-ray fluorescence (XRF).³ Even though areas on most of the coins were prepared to remove surface corrosion, the accuracy of this method is less good than those requiring a sample to be removed, such as atomic absorption spectrometry (AAS); the latter method was applied to some of the coins. Preliminary tests had indicated accuracies within the range \pm 10–15% relative for lead and \pm 5–10% for tin and zinc. Errors are likely to be highest for lead as this element forms a separate phase in the alloy. Subsequently, further comparisons between the XRF analyses and AAS analyses on drilled samples from the coins has indicated that the errors in the lead content may be somewhat higher at \pm 20–25% relative in a few cases and for tin up to ±15–20%, particularly where there is extensive surface corrosion. Therefore any interpretation of the XRF analysis data on the individual coins published here must take this accuracy into account. As noted above, the XRF project was intended as a preliminary survey that could be followed up by accurate analysis of parts of the series, by AAS or inductively-coupled spectrometry (ICPAES), where interesting trends in composition were found. This was the case with the Ming and Qing dynasty coins where the change from bronze to brass was investigated further, together with aspects of brass manufacture and imports of copper.⁴

Notes

- 1 For example, Dai Zhiqiang and Zhou Weirong, 'Study of the alloy composition of more than two thousand years of Chinese coins (5th c. bc to 20th c. ad)', *Journal of the Historical Metallurgical Society* 26, no. 2 (1992), 45–55. Zhao Kuanghua, Wang Weiping, Hua Jueming, Zhang Hongli, 'An analysis of the chemical composition of Northern Song bronze coins and a tentative inquiry into the quality of *dantong* in Song dynasty', *Studies in the History of Natural Sciences*1986(5), 321–30. Yuji Sano, Kenji Notsu and Takeshi Tominaga 'Studies on chemical composition of ancient coins by multivariate analysis', *Scientific Papers on Japanese Antiquities and Art Crafts* 28 (1983), 44–58.
- 2 For example, Dai Zhiqiang and Zhou Weirong, 'Study of the metal composition'.
- 3 M. Cowell and H. Wang, 'Metal supply for the metropolitan coinage of the Kangxi period (1662–1721)', *Numismatic Chronicle* 158 (1998), 185–96.
- 4 M.R. Cowell, J. Cribb, S.G.E. Bowman and Y. Shashoua, 'The Chinese cash: composition and production', in M.M. Archibald and M.R. Cowell (eds), *Metallurgy in Numismatics 3* (Royal Numismatic Society, London, 1993), 185–96. Cowell and Wang, 'Metal supply'.

Notes to the Metallurgical Tables

No.

The coins are numbered individually on the plates.

British Museum registration numbers

As far as possible, coins were selected from established collections within the Department of Coins and Medals, British Museum. The registration numbers usually follow the format *year-month-group-item*. In this way, the registration number 1883-8-2-86 can be interpreted as the 86th item in the 2nd group acquired in the 8th month (August) of the year 1883. The registration numbers also indicate the provenance of the coins:

The only coin in this study that is not in the Department of Coins and Medals belongs to Mr. N.G. Rhodes (Treasurer of the Royal Numismatic Society).

Period

The periods or dynasties in which the coins were issued.

Obverse

The inscription on the front of the coin. The inscription is sometimes followed by two letters which indicate the script style:

- CL = Clerk script (*Li shu*) ST = Standard script (*Kai shu*)
- CU = Cursive script (*Xing shu*)
- GR = Grass script (*Cao shu*)
- SE = Seal script (*Zhuan shu*)

All the coins used in this survey before AD 621 are written in a version of seal script; from then until 916 all are written in clerk script. From 916 until 1130 a range of scripts are used and indicated in the table; after 1130 all are written in standard script

Reverse

The inscription or marks on the back of the coin.

Mint, Denomination, Date, Weight

Where the coin was made, its value, its date of issue (all AD unless indicated otherwise), and its weight (in grammes).

Technique

The techniques used to analysis the coins:

- $XRFA = X-ray$ fluorescence (abraded) the surface of the coin was cleaned prior to testing
- $XRFU = X-ray$ fluorescence (unabraded) the surface of the coin was not cleaned prior to testing
- AAS = Atomic absorption spectometry

For the AAS results, the copper content is not recorded.

Cu, Sn, Zn, Pb, Fe

- $Cu = Copper$
- $Sn = Tin$
- $Zn = Zinc$
- $Pb =$ Lead
- $Fe = Iron$

l.

J. l, \overline{a} l.

l. i. \bar{a} \overline{a} l, $\ddot{}$ l,

 \bar{a}

 \mathbf{r}

 \mathbf{r}

 \mathbf{r} \mathbf{r} \mathcal{L}

J. J. $\ddot{}$ J. l.

l. \mathbf{r} i. l. \mathbb{R}^2 l,

 \overline{a}

 \mathbf{r}

 \mathbb{R}^2 $\frac{1}{2}$ i. ÷. \mathbf{r} i. \mathbb{R}^2 \mathbf{r} \mathbb{R}^2 l. \overline{a} l. l. \mathbf{r} l. \mathbf{r}

J.

i. $\overline{}$ ÷. \mathbf{r}

 \bar{a}

Metallurgical Analysis of Chinese Coins at the British Museum| 27

| Metallurgical Analysis of Chinese Coins at the British Museum

103 104 105 106

123 124 125 126 127

| Metallurgical Analysis of Chinese Coins at the British Museum

174

183 184 185

| Metallurgical Analysis of Chinese Coins at the British Museum

226 227 228

234 235 236 237 238

240 241 242

| Metallurgical Analysis of Chinese Coins at the British Museum

252 253 254 255 256

270 271 272 273 274

280 281 282

301 302 303 304

308 309 310

320 321 322

328 329 330

346

353 354 355

362 363 364

366 367 368

370 371 372

379 380 381 382

383 384 385 386

392 393 394

400 401 402

404 405 406

408 409 410 411

413

421 422 423 424 425

427

440 441 442 443 444

446 447 448 449

458 459 460

466 467 468 469 470

476 477 478

493 494

496

| Metallurgical Analysis of Chinese Coins at the British Museum

513 514 515 516

e

Metallurgical Analysis of Chinese Coins at the British Museum| 57

525 526 527

544

The Chinese Cash: Composition and Production Michael Cowell, Joe Cribb, Sheridan Bowman andYvonne Shashoua

Introduction

In this paper we summarise the results of an analytical survey of the Chinese cash copper alloy coinage from the earliest issues of the Han period in the 3rd century bc to the end of the Qing dynasty in the early 20th century. Details of the analytical techniques used can be found elsewhere,¹ the analytical data for the later coins is listed in **Table 2**.

The survey was instigated primarily to provide a dated series of analyses of typical Chinese copper-based metalwork. This has revealed new information about the developments of alloying in China for coinage manufacture which can be compared with methods used for other types of artefact. The contemporary records of cash production, which often specify the quality and quantities of the various metals used in the alloy and individual mint practices, may also be correlated with the established composition of the coins. The most important aspect in this respect is the first use of brass for the coinage and the information which analysis provides about the technology of its manufacture.

Manufacturing technique and alloys

Although economics would no doubt have been an important factor in the type of alloys used for the manufacture of the cash, as in all aspects of currency production, due account had also to be given to the methods by which the coinage was produced. Throughout the whole of the period surveyed the cash was manufactured entirely by casting. Contemporary accounts indicate that there were periodic modifications to the process, but these were primarily concerned with the materials or the manner with which the moulds were made.

The most complete description of the manufacturing procedure specifically relates to mid-17th-century practice,² when vertical sand (loess) moulds were used to cast batches of coin on a tree-like network (**Pl. 1.1 see cover**) weighing up to 6kg, but the general principles of the operation had changed little for over a millenium. After casting the coins were separated from the tree structure linking them together. They were then carefully cleaned and abraded to remove sprue, and finally strung together in thousands.

There are advantages in producing coins by casting rather than striking. The process is labour intensive but involves relatively simple technology, especially when compared with machine methods, and requires less skilled personnel as might be employed in most foundry workshops. A major disadvantage is that forgery is easy and difficult to detect since a single authentic coin can be used to produce any number of copies using the same process by which the original was made. Very detailed designs cannot be reproduced consistently and individual accurate weight control could also be difficult to achieve. The technique was most suited, therefore, to the mass production of a low value base-metal denomination, such as the cash, where the profit margin was small.

For casting cash, alloys had to be used which were suitable for this method of production. These would not necessarily be appropriate for the manufacture of coinage by striking, particularly if sheet metal was required for the blanks. Essentially two types of alloy were used for cash manufacture over the period surveyed: tin bronze up to the early 16th century and then brass until the early 19th century. For virtually the whole of this period, however, irrespective of whether bronze or brass was used, the alloys are leaded. The chronological variation in the lead content is illustrated in **Fig.1**. The lead content is highest in the bronze coins and typically ranges from 10 to 20%, peaking at around 30% for coins issued during the 12th and 13th centuries. In the brass coins the lead content is lower and mostly in the range 2 to 8%, averaging about 5%. The use of leaded alloys was partly influenced by the cost and availability of metals, but their technical suitability must also have been a major consideration.

The addition of lead to bronze or brass has two important effects: it slightly lowers the freezing point of the alloy (by about 100°C with 20% lead added to bronze) and markedly increases the fluidity of the molten metal.³ Both of these features are desirable in the manufacture of small, detailed items by casting. The increase in fluidity is most marked up to about 3% lead after which there is a slow but further steady improvement. This is just below the concentration in the later brass issues where the lead has probably been added solely for technical rather than economic reasons. By contrast, during the 12th and 13th centuries when the lead content was highest it was almost certainly added primarily to reduce costs.

Developments in brass production

The major change in the coinage alloy from bronze to brass occurred during the early part of the 16th century, specifically during the later Hongzhi period, 1503–05 (**Pl. I.3–5**). This changeover was almost certainly prompted by economics. As zinc became a cheaper metal than lead it was profitable to substitute zinc for some of the lead and most of the tin without detriment to the properties of the alloy. In fact, there would have been some improvement since zinc is a better de-oxidant than tin and the quality of the castings would have been improved.

For some time the alloy used was not a 'pure' brass but one more accurately described as a quaternary alloy containing substantial amounts of tin and lead in addition to zinc and, of course, copper (**Fig. 2**). The lead content was soon reduced and stabilised but the tin content had virtually disappeared by the 17th century. It is of particular interest to establish when the Chinese first used brass for their coinage and, most importantly, to determine how that brass was manufactured.

Zinc is not an easy metal to isolate in the pure state because it is very readily oxidised and has a low boiling point (913°C).

Plate 1.1 See cover Chinese 'money tree', brass 10 cash coins still attached to casting sprue.This example was made at the Board of Revenue Mint, Beijing, *c*.1905.

Plate 1.2–3 Bronze versions of Hongzhi tongbao coins of the Ming dynasty, issued in 1503 (16th year of the Hongzhi reign period). Coin nos 440 and 436. Plate 1.4–5 Brass versions of Hongzhi tongbao coins of the Ming dynasty, issued in 1505 (18th year of the Hongzhi reign period). Note the different calligraphic style of the inscriptions, which are written with thinner strokes than those on the bronze coins (2–3). Coin nos 450 and 451.

Plate 1.6 Lacquered brass version of Longqing tongbao coins of the Ming dynasty, issued 1570 (4th year of the Longqing reign period). Coin no. 463. Plate 1.7–8 Lacquered brass versions of Wanli tongbao coins of the Ming dynasty, issued 1537–82 (Wanli reign period). Coin nos 480 and 471.

Conventional smelting will readily produce the free metal but this immediately vapourises, re-oxidises and is lost with the flue gases. To extract the pure metal in any quantity requires a complex reduction, distillation, and condensation process which may have been first perfected in India during the 14th century AD or perhaps a little earlier.⁴ Brass can, however, be manufactured directly by the cementation process, used extensively by the Romans, in which zinc metal is generated, by reduction, from an ore mixed with reducing agents in close contact with copper metal in a closed vessel. The zinc vapour, formed *in situ*, is absorbed by the copper to produce brass. This process has been known since the 3rd century bc but limits the brass composition which can be made to those containing not more than about 28% zinc.⁵ On the other hand, with metallic zinc available there is no upper limit to the composition of brass which can be manufactured.

The point at issue here is whether the Chinese were using brass for their coinage which had been made by the older cementation method or from metallic zinc and copper, that is by speltering. The primary source of information on 17th-century manufacture, the *Tian gong kai wu* [*T'ien-kung k'ai-wu*] clearly refers to the use of metallic zinc by specifying the quantities of the individual metals.⁶ The current analyses show that the brass coinage can be traced back over 100 years before the date of that publication and there is strong evidence that all these brass issues, from their inception during the Hongzhi period in the early 16th century, were made by speltering rather than cementation.

The evidence centres on the large amounts of lead and, particularly, tin in the early brasses. Most of the early 16thcentury brass coins contain less than the 28% zinc limit achievable by cementation manufacture and all could, in theory, have been made using that process. However, the large amounts of tin and lead also present are unlikely to have been introduced into the alloy as pure metals. In fact there would have been little point in continuing to add the much more expensive tin since, as noted above, zinc is equally effective metallurgically. It is much more likely that the tin and lead were introduced, along with copper, by the re-cycling of scrap leaded bronze coinage (or other cast metalwork) which seems to have been normal practice at the mint. The results suggest that for the earliest issues up to 50% of the metal input could have been in the form of scrap. On this assumption, if cementation brass had been used the dilution with scrap would have resulted in a zinc content below that actually found in the coins.

There are two items of near contemporary information which substantiate the production of brass for coinage at this time and, incidentally, the use of metallic zinc for this purpose. The geographer Gu Ziyu [Ku Tsu-yu], writing in 1667, reports that brass coins were used from 1520,⁷ and in the *Ming shi* [*Ming Shih*] it is noted that a proportion of a different metal, described as 'good' or 'superior tin' was *added* to some of the issues in the Hongzhi period, 1503–05.⁸ This may be referring to zinc because the quantities involved are close to those actually found in the coins. The minor difference in the dates at which brass was first reportedly used is reconciled by the fact that only a minority of the Hongzhi coins are described as brass (actually 10% of the issues examined so far prove to be of that alloy) whereas after this period (i.e. later than 1520) *all* the central mint coins are brass.

Figure 1Average lead content

Figure 2 Alloy composition of the early brass issues

The signficance of this early availability of metallic zinc is that it substantially predates its introduction to Europe.⁹ The analyses unfortunately cannot precisely determine whether the 16th-century zinc was made in China, as it most certainly was by the early 17th century, or if it was imported, possibly from India. However, there is some indication of either a change in the method of zinc manufacture or its source during the 17th century from the concentration of the metal cadmium in the brass coins. In coins issued before about 1620 cadmium is usually not detected and never exceeds 0.002% (20 ppm). After this date the cadmium concentration is often much higher (although it never exceeds trace amounts) with some later coins containing over 0.01% (100 ppm) of the metal.

There are several possible explanations for this increased cadmium content. Cadmium minerals are commonly associated with zinc ores and would be expected to be extracted with that metal. Therefore the increase may simply be the result of exploiting different, cadmium-rich, zinc ore sources. Alternatively, the use of a different method of ore treatment or smelting may have resulted in the retention of cadmium in the zinc metal whereas previously it was lost. There are significant differences between the Indian and Chinese methods of zinc manufacture. In the Chinese method, as illustrated in the *Tian gong kai wu*, the metallic zinc is retained within the sealed vessel containing the reduction mixture but in the Indian process the zinc is distilled off into a separate, cooled, receiver.¹⁰ Cadmium is more volatile than zinc (b.pt.765°C as opposed to 913°C) and would therefore be more readily lost during a distillation process like that used in India but retained in the sealed container used in China. Nevertheless, ore processing could also

be an important factor. For example, any pretreatment of ores by roasting would encourage the preferential loss of cadmium which might otherwise be retained in the metal. A changeover from sulphide (sphalerite) ores, which required roasting to the oxide prior to smelting, to carbonate (smithsonite) ores might therefore influence the cadmium content of the end product.

Mint standards

The dynastic histories often record the quantities of the various metals used in the casting of coins. For the Ming and Qing dynasties the normal quantities of metal used were 6 or 7 parts of copper and 3 or 4 parts of zinc.¹¹ However, coins containing the most zinc were the least regarded and first class cash contained only 1 part zinc to 9 parts copper whereas forgeries were said to consist of equal amounts of the two metals. Nevertheless, due to acute shortages of copper, there was an official decision in 1683 to increase the proportion of the cheaper zinc in the coinage alloy from 30 to 40% .¹²

The composition of coins issued up to 1723 (**Fig. 2**) shows that very few contain 40% or more of zinc, the majority falling between 20 and 38%. Histograms show peaks at around 22% and 35% zinc. There would, therefore, appear to be little correspondence with the quoted composition of the coinage. However, a factor which must be taken into account is the volatility of zinc both during the primary manufacture of brass by speltering or the re-melting of scrap brass. According to the *Tian gong kai wu*, for the formulation of brass, zinc was added to molten copper (which would be at a temperature above the boiling point of zinc) and this could result in the loss of a quarter of the zinc added. If this loss was not compensated for by adding more than the stipulated amount then the final alloy would contain substantially less zinc than was intended. Indeed, it is probable that the quoted proportions of metal refer to the actual amounts to be *used* by the mint (i.e. added to the copper) and not the final composition to be aimed at.

Taking these losses into account, we can compare the average measured composition of coins issued just before and just after the alloy change in 1683 with their expected compositions (**Table 1**).

Table 1 Analysed zinc contents compared with documentary references

The actual composition of these coins is thus in reasonable accordance with the documented intentions and practices of the mint.

Surface treatment

An extraordinary mint practice initiated in the Ming dynasty, which was apparently prompted by the purity of the raw materials, and also by the quantity of zinc in the alloy, was the application of lacquer to the coin surface. The *Tian gong kai wu* notes that there were two types of yellow (brass) cash in the early 17th century: gold-back cash using four times refined copper and fire-lacquer cash using only two times refined copper. The latter coins were apparently coated on both sides with black lacquer over a fire to protect the less refined alloy

from corrosion. It is also implied that less zinc was added to the alloy used for the fire-lacquer cash. This clearly time-consuming and probably expensive operation was presumably one of the last steps in what was already a labour-intensive process of coin manufacture.

The lacquering still appears to survive on many coins of the 16th to the 18th centuries as either a black sheen on the lowest parts of the field or a black waxy material infilling the recesses between the lettering (**Pl. 1.7–8**). It never seems to be present on the raised parts of the design which in any case would have been rubbed clean once the coins left the mint. A number of coins dating from 1527 to about 1736, which visually show strong evidence of lacquering, have been examined to establish the nature of this coating. Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR) was used to analyse small samples taken from surfaces of the coins.¹³

All the samples, except one from a coin issued in the period 1646 –53, produced spectra comparable with urushiol,¹⁴ which is the characteristic constituent of Chinese or Japanese lacquer. This is derived from the sap of a tree, *rhus vernicifera*, and was widely used in the East as a decorative material on organic, ceramic and metallic artefacts. One coin had been coated with shellac which is of insect origin. The application of lacquer appears to have continued, therefore, well into the 18th century.

The original purpose of the lacquer, to protect issues made from less refined metal, implies that there should be a difference in the composition of coins with and without lacquer. An examination of elements in the alloy which would be reduced in concentration by prolonged refining (e.g. antimony and arsenic) indicates that there are slightly higher amounts in the lacquered coins (antimony plus arsenic averages 0.35%) compared to those with no lacquer apparent (0.29%). The differences are hardly significant and may be less clear cut because, whereas lacquered coins can easily be identified, it is of course impossible to be certain whether those without a coating now were never lacquered or have simply lost the coating through cleaning and corrosion.

[First published in M.M. Archibald and M.R. Cowell (eds), *Metallurgy in Numismatic*s 3 (Royal Numismatic Society, London, 1993), 185–96.]

Notes

- 1 S.G.E. Bowman, M.R. Cowell and J. Cribb, 'Two thousand years of coinage in China: an analytical survey' *Historical Metallurgy* 23 (1989), 25–30.
- 2 Song Yingxing [Sung Ying-Hsing], *Tian gong kai wu* (1637). See translations by E-Tu Zen Sun and Shion-Chuan Sun, *Chinese Technology in the 17th Century* (Pennsylvania, 1966), 165–69, which refers specifically to coin manufacture, and also to that by W. Burger, *Ch'ing Cash until 1735* (Taiwan, 1976), especially 22–24.
- 3 J. Young, 'The addition of lead to alloys in the Late Bronze Age' (Institute of Archaeology, London, BSc project report, undated and unpublished).
- The Indian process, as used at Zawar, is described by P.T. Craddock, L.K. Gurjar and K.T.M. Hegde, 'Zinc production in mediaeval India', *World Archaeology* 15 (1983), 211–17. The traditional Chinese process, with little modification, was still being used relatively recently; the process has been described by Xu Li, *Ziran kexue shi yanjiu (Studies in the History of the Natural Sciences*) 5 (1986), 361–69, now translated by J.O. Petersen, 'Traditional zinc smelting in the Guima district of Hezhang County', in *2000 Years of Zinc Smelting* (British Museum Occasional Paper 50, 1990), 103–22.
- 5 A. Burnett, P.T. Craddock and K. Preston, 'New light on the origins of

aurichalcum', in *Proceedings of the 9th International Congress on Numismatics* (Berne, 1979), 263–68; P.T. Craddock, A. Burnett and K. Preston, 'Hellenistic copper-based coinage and the origins of brass', in *Scientific Studies in Numismatics* (British Museum Occasional Paper 18, 1980), 53–64. It is possible to produce cementation brass with a higher zinc content of 33–34% if the copper is in granular form, i.e. of large surface area, produced by pouring the molten metal through a mesh and into water. This modified process was patented in England in the early 18th century but similar methods were probably practiced earlier than this in Europe in general. See, for example, J. Day, *Bristol Brass: History of an Industry* (Newton Abbott, 1973); M.B. Mitchiner, C. Mortimer and A.M. Pollard, 'The alloys of continental copper-base jetons (Nuremberg and mediaeval France excepted)', *Numismatic Chronicle* 148 (1988), 117–28.

- 6 E-Tu Zen Sun and Shion-Chuan Sun, *Chinese Technology*, 165.
- 7 Gu Ziyu [Ku Tsu-yu], *Tushi yu ji yao* [*Tu shih yu chi yao*] (1667). See J. Needham, *Science and Civilisation in China,* V:2 (Cambridge, 1974), 231.

8 O.Y. Tsai, *Zhongguo guquan jianghua* (Taipei, 1973); F. Thierry, 'Le

Table 2 Analyses of Chinese cash issues after AD 1400

monnayage de l'empereur Xiao Zong des Ming (1487–1505): deux variétés inédites', *Bulletin de la Société Française de Numismatique* (Jan, 1987), 139–41.

- 9 Zinc had been exported to Europe from the East since the early 17th century, see Needham, *Science and Civilisation*, 212.
- 10 See note 4.
- 11 E-Tu Zen Sun and Shion-Chuan Sun, *Chinese Technology*, 165.
- 12 Burger, *Ch'ing Cash*, 67. At this time there was also an influx of foreign copper, chiefly from Japan. This seems to be reflected in a composition change since coins of this period (1662–1722, middle and late issues) have lower concentrations of antimony, nickel, arsenic and cobalt, all elements which may be related to the copper source.
- 13 We are grateful to the staff of the Conservation Department of the Victoria and Albert Museum for allowing us to use their FTIR instrument.
- 14 J. Kumanotani, A. Achiwa, R. Oshuna and K. Adachi, 'Japanese lacquer as a durable material', *Cultural Property and Analytical Chemistry* (1979), 51–62.

Cowell, Cribb, Bowman and Shashoua

Table 2 (cont.) Analyses of Chinese cash issues after AD 1400

Cast Iron Coins of Song Dynasty China: A Metallurgical Study Michael L.Wayman and Helen Wang

Abstract

A selection of 37 Song dynasty Chinese cast iron coins was subjected to metallurgical analysis. From inscriptions, these are dated between 1078 and 1215 ad*, and the mint locations of 23 of the coins are known. All were found to be white cast irons, but they separated into two types, one with relatively high levels of silicon, phosphorus and sulphur and divorced eutectic microstructures, and the other with low levels of these three elements and ledeburitic microstructures. Those coins that were minted in Shaanxi were all found to be of the first type, while those minted in the Hubei/Anhui region to the southeast are all of the second type. On the basis of sulphur content it is believed to be likely that iron used for the first group was smelted in coal- or coke-fired blast furnaces, while the iron in the second group was smelted using charcoal. This is in general agreement with what is known of the iron industry in China during the Song period.*

Introduction

Analysis of objects from the past is often useful in providing information about aspects of life in earlier times and in this regard studies of coins have particular advantages. The date and location data they can convey, combined with the results of metallurgical analysis, have the potential to offer information that is important and relevant far beyond the field of numismatics. In the present work the main concern is with metallurgical and processing issues.

Here a selection of 37 Song dynasty cast iron coins from the collections of the Department of Coins and Medals, British Museum has been subjected to metallurgical analysis. The coins range in date from the 11th to the 13th centuries AD, but it is possible from the coin inscriptions to establish to within a few years the dates of the individual coins and in some cases to determine the locations of the mints where they were produced. Although based on a limited number of coins, the study allows an initial investigation of the production processes of cast iron and of iron coins, including chronological and geographical differences. These touch on specific questions, relating to:

- the characteristics of the cast iron used for coinage;
- the iron production processes used;
- the technology of coin production operations, including any heat treatment and/or mechanical processing carried out after casting;
- chronological, geographical and mint variations among the coins;
- comparison of Song dynasty coin-casting technology with contemporary Chinese non-coin cast ironwork.

Of course, metallurgical analysis of a much larger number of coins would be necessary to address these questions comprehensively; furthermore the methodology could potentially be extended to include issues such as comparisons

with cast iron coins and non-coin ironwork from other regions of East and Southeast Asia.

This paper presents the Song dynasty coins in historical context, and the results of their analyses along with a discussion of those results and their possible significance.

Song dynasty iron coins

Although the vast majority of Chinese coins through the ages were cast in bronze or brass, small quantities of iron coins are known to have been made at least as early as $AD 24$,¹ and then during the Tang dynasty (AD 618–907) and the Five Dynasties period (ad 907–960). However, iron coin production became much more commonplace during the Song dynasty (AD 960– 1279), when rapid commercial growth created a demand for large amounts of money.² Shortages of raw materials, such as the copper and tin needed to make bronze, are believed to be one of the major factors that stimulated the production of cast iron coinage. The advantages of using iron are obvious: iron ore was widely available, and cast iron is cheaper to produce than bronze. On the other hand their poor resistance to corrosion in many environments and the relative difficulty of obtaining a fine impression has kept iron from becoming a viable competitor to copper-based coinage materials under most sets of circumstances. There was a well-developed iron industry in China, as well as a long history of fine casting, and the technology for casting bronze coins could be applied to the casting of iron coins.

Iron coin production in Song dynasty China was neither homogeneous nor static. In general, it appears that during the Northern Song period (AD 960–1127) mints in different localities produced either bronze coins or iron coins, and in some cases both.³ During the Southern Song period (AD 1127–1279) iron coins were circulated predominantly in Sichuan Province.

The volume of coin production also varied over time. The most intense period of coin production was the Yuanfeng reign period (1078–1085), during which the annual output has been estimated at over 5 million strings of bronze coins and 1 million strings of iron coins, with each string nominally holding 1,000 coins. There were during this period 17 inspectorates (mints) for bronze coins and nine for iron coins; of the latter six were located in Shaanxi and three in Sichuan.⁴ Coin production dropped dramatically during the Southern Song period, in part because of the use of paper money.

Of the 37 Song dynasty iron coins selected for this study, 11 date from the Northern Song period and 26 from the Southern Song. The physical dimensions of the coins are given in **Table 1**. On the obverse of each coin is a four-character inscription. The first two characters indicate the reign period during which it was issued, localizing the date to within a 5–15 year period.⁵ The second two characters read '*tongbao', 'yuanbao' or 'xinbao*', literally 'circulating treasure' or 'first treasure' or 'new treasure',

Table 1 Coin data and dimensions

respectively (**Fig. 1**). On the reverse of some coins there is a one or two character inscription indicating the year of the reign period in which it was issued, and/or the mint where it was produced. For example the numeral 5 on a coin of the Shaoxi reign period (AD 1190–94) refers to year 5 of that period (AD 1194). In the case of the Chunxi reign period (ad 1174–89), year numbers were given to coins beginning in year 7 (AD 1180) so coins without numbers are taken as being within the range AD 1174–79.

Figure 1 *Jiading tongbao* coin.The front (right) has a four-character inscription Jia ding tong bao arranged top-bottom-right-left around the square hole. Jiading identifies the reign period, *tongbao* means 'circulating treasure'.The back (left) has a two-character inscription *chun er* arranged above and below the hole.

Experimental procedure

Examinations were carried out using optical and scanning electron metallography to characterize the microstructures of the coins. Compositional information was obtained by energydispersive X-ray microanalysis (EDX) in the scanning electron microscope (SEM). The coins were also subjected to Xradiography. Air path energy-dispersive X-ray fluorescence analysis (XRF) was used as required.

The cutting of metallographic cross-sections in order to characterize the material was not permitted in the case of these coins, which have display and study value as part of a museum collection. As a result, analysis was carried out on a flat surface prepared (as described below) on the rim of each coin. However, it was first necessary to evaluate whether metallographic analyses carried out on the prepared rim flats of the coins gave results, both compositions and microstructures, comparable with bulk characterizations obtained on the coin cross-sections. This evaluation was accomplished by examining both the prepared rim surfaces and the bulk cross-sections of four selected iron coins. Three of these were Song dynasty Chinese coins that were already in a damaged condition, so that it was permissible to cut bulk samples from them as well as to examine their rim surfaces, while the fourth was an 18th-century Japanese cast iron coin, then in a private collection and later

donated to the Museum collection.⁶ For bulk analysis, two of these coins were sectioned completely across their cross-sections (from the outer rim to the central square hole) while wedgeshaped sections were cut inwards from the rims of the other two. Metallurgical analyses were then carried out on these cut sections and the results compared with the results of similar analyses carried out on prepared rim flats on the same coins.

After completing these preliminary investigations, which showed that the rim analyses were indeed sufficiently representative to be utilized with confidence, a further 34 coins were analysed, all on their rim surfaces.

To prepare an area on the rim for metallography, each coin was held in a purpose-built brass jig equipped with hard rubber padding to prevent gripping-damage. With the coin held firmly in the jig, a location on the rim of the coin was then abraded on silicon carbide grit paper using water lubrication and cooling. In most cases only a fine (600 grit) paper was used, however where necessary grinding started on coarser (240 or 320 grit) silicon carbide grinding paper and progressed through 400 grit to 600 grit with careful washing between stages. The grinding procedure produced a flat area a few millimetres in length across the full width of the coin rim.

With the coin still held in the jig, metallographic polishing of the flat area was then carried out on a polishing wheel rotating at 250 rpm, first using 6 μ m diamond paste on a nylon cloth and then $I \mu$ m diamond paste on a short-napped cloth, in both cases employing an oil-based lubricant. When the polished rim flat had been washed thoroughly and dried, the coin was removed from the jig and examined using a Zeiss reflected light microscope and a JEOL SEM which was equipped with an Oxford Isis EDX analysis system with a Ge detector and an ultrathin detector window. Examination in this unetched condition provided information on the presence or absence of gas and shrinkage porosity, the state of corrosion damage, and the nonmetallic inclusion abundance and distribution. Also at this stage chemical microanalysis was carried out using SEM-EDX in order to determine the bulk contents of silicon, phosphorus, sulphur and manganese as well as the compositions of the nonmetallic inclusions. The polished flats were then etched with 2% nital and re-examined using both optical and scanning electron microscopy to characterize all of the microstructural constituent phases.

Standard reference materials were also analysed for silicon, phosphorus, sulphur and manganese by performing SEM-EDX analyses under conditions identical to those used for the coins. Those used were British Chemical Standards SS 551, SS 554 and 183/3, all issued by the Bureau of Analysed Samples Ltd, and NBS 661 from the US National Bureau of Standards. This confirmed that the lower limits of detection of these elements were approximately 0.1–0.15%. The SEM-EDX results can be considered to have a precision and accuracy of \pm 10–20% relative to the values obtained.

Carbon contents were estimated from photomicrographs of representative areas of the etched microstructures, as SEM-EDX is not suitable for carbon determination. The relative areas of proeutectic phases and eutectic constituents were obtained by point counting, and converted to carbon content by two methods. Assuming equilibrium cooling and using the equilibrium phase diagram gave one value for carbon content. However, to allow for cooling being rapid enough that

equilibrium conditions were not obtained, a second carbon content was calculated assuming that solidification occurred under equilibrium conditions but that no subsequent changes (other than the austenite-to-pearlite transformation) occurred during further cooling to room temperature. An estimated carbon content was obtained by averaging these two values, giving heavier weighting to the equilibrium value. The carbon contents thus obtained must be considered as accurate to no better than \pm o.1% carbon.

Analytical results

Metallographic examination of the ground and polished rim flats showed that all of the coins have elemental compositions and microstructures that identify them unambiguously as white cast irons.

Compositions

The elements of major importance in determining the microstructures of cast irons are carbon, silicon, phosphorus, sulphur and manganese. The contents of the last four of these elements in the coins as determined using SEM-EDX are presented in **Table 2**. Detection limits for these elements are in the order of 0.1%, so concentrations less than this amount would not have been detected; these cases are reported in the Table as 'nd'. The carbon contents were estimated as described above.

Silicon is present at detectable levels in some coins, with contents up to about 0.8% (**Table 2**). Microanalysis showed that the silicon is localized in the pearlite constituent of the microstructure, having been in solution in the austenite at high temperatures. The phosphorus content also varies among the coins, up to a maximum of about 1.7% (note that this is very high by modern standards). The phosphorus is present in the microstructure as steadite, the binary or ternary eutectic constituent (i.e. the iron-iron phosphide eutectic mixture or the iron-iron phosphide-iron carbide eutectic mixture respectively).

The observed range of sulphur content as measured by SEM-EDX in these coins extends to slightly above 2%S, also far above levels in modern irons. Sulphur occurs in these cast irons in the form of sulphide inclusions in the microstructure; the sulphur contents in the iron matrix between the inclusions are below detection limits. The relative abundances of the sulphide particles as observed metallographically are in accord with the measured sulphur contents and correlate well with the two types of microstructure observed, ledeburitic and divorced eutectic, as will be discussed below.

Manganese was detected in only one of these coins (cm11) where the manganese content is about 0.3% and the sulphide inclusions were found to be mixed manganese-iron sulphides averaging more than 25%Mn. In all the other coins it must be present in amounts less than about 0.1%, its detection limit in the SEM-EDX system.

Other than in coin cm11, the sulphide inclusions are iron sulphides containing minor amounts of manganese (up to 5%) and titanium (up to 0.5%). However, two of the coins, cm7 and cm12, also contain appreciable amounts of copper in some of the sulphide particles. These particular sulphide inclusions could be seen in the SEM to consist of two phases, the brighter of which contains as much as 20% copper. The sulphide particles in some of the other coins contain smaller (less than 1%) amounts of copper or vanadium.

Wayman and Wang

Coin cm12 was observed to have a brassy colour, unlike any of the other coins, and XRF analysis showed that indeed a layer of brass containing approximately 70% copper and 30% zinc is present on the surface of this coin. The XRF spectrum exhibited strong iron peaks emanating from the base iron beneath the brass layer, showing that the brass layer is thin, likely of the order of a few tens of micrometres. Microscopical study of the surface of this particular coin showed that its topography is rough, as is usual in iron objects that have undergone surface corrosion, and that the brass layer is on the outer surface, i.e. on top of the corrosion layer. This was confirmed by examination of the edges of the ground and polished flat area of the coin rim, which revealed the brass layer in cross-section. These observations show that the brass layer must have been applied *after* the coin corroded, and so the brass layer must be unrelated to the original manufacture of the coin. The history of this particular coin is unknown, as it was an anonymous donation to the Museum. This is a very curious effect. It is conceivable that the brass layer could have been inadvertently deposited during electrochemical cleaning in an electrolyte containing copper and zinc ions, or possibly it was deliberately electroplated for unknown reasons. In any event this plating was certainly done in the relatively recent past, perhaps for collecting purposes. Song dynasty coins were still in use in the early 20th century.

Microstructures

No graphite was observed in any of the microstructures; the presence of graphite would have identified the materials as grey or mottled cast iron. Instead, although there were microstructural differences among the coins, all had white cast iron microstructures, i.e. mixtures of cementite and pearlite, with a range of morphologies as described below.

The details of the microstructures are given in **Table 3**, where it can be seen that the coins can be grouped into two major microstructural categories. One of these, termed 'ledeburitic', had a matrix of ledeburite (the eutectic constituent which consists of cementite and austenite, the latter typically having transformed to pearlite during cooling) with varying amounts of the proeutectic phases pearlite or cementite. Thus, for example, the microstructures of some coins contained only ledeburite (**Fig. 2**), while others consisted of a matrix of ledeburite with various amounts of proeutectic pearlite (**Figs 3 and 4**) or proeutectic cementite (**Fig. 5**). This type of microstructure is typical of the solidification of eutectic and near-eutectic alloys, as described in the Discussion section below. The other type of microstructure observed, termed 'divorced eutectic', consisted of a matrix of cementite in which are embedded pearlite dendrites (**Figs 6 and 7**). In these coins the pearlite dendrites occupied between 45% and 80% of the microstructure, the balance being cementite. Two of the coins, cm4 and cm11, did not fall clearly into either group, as they had microstructures which were mixtures of the two main types.

In addition to the phases described above, several other microconstituents were observed to be present to varying extents within the microstructures of the coins (see **Table 3**). Notable among these are the phosphorus-bearing constituent steadite. Both the two- and three-phase eutectic mixture described above have melting temperatures below 1,000°C and hence they are invariably found in the last regions of the microstructure to solidify, i.e. at the boundaries of the ledeburite colonies in the ledeburitic microstructures and between the proeutectic pearlite dendrites or ledeburite laths in the divorced eutectic microstructures. Steadite was observed in most of the coins; its relative abundance, as reported in **Table 3**, agreed well with the phosphorus contents of the coins as measured by EDX.

Another commonly observed microstructural constituent was inclusions of iron sulphide, some of which contained manganese as mentioned above. These sulphide particles (visible for example in **Fig. 7**, where they appear as light grey blobs within the cementite) were found to be especially abundant in some coins and absent or extremely rare in others, as reported in **Table 3**. The observed abundances of sulphide inclusions in the microstructures were found to be higher in coins with higher measured sulphur contents (**Table 2**), as expected, and furthermore there is a striking correlation between sulphur content (or sulphide particle abundance) and microstructural category. Thus the sulphur content in the ledeburitic coins was below detection limits, in sharp contrast to the levels in the divorced eutectic coins. Like the steadite, the sulphide particles are found at interdendritic locations since during solidification the sulphur, like the phosphorus, is concentrated in the liquid between the proeutectic constituents.

Along with the various metallurgical phases and constituents mentioned above, two types of porosity were observed in these coins, gas porosity and shrinkage porosity. Gas porosity, which occurs as spherical bubbles, arises when gases that are dissolved in the liquid iron are precipitated during solidification as a result of their having much smaller solubilities in solid iron than in the liquid. In contrast, shrinkage porosity is a consequence of the solid material occupying less volume than the liquid so that as the microstructural constituents grow together during solidification there is insufficient liquid metal available to form a space-filling metallic structure. The result is that gaps are left between the constituents, i.e. on the boundaries between the solidification colonies.

Gas porosity was observed to be present at a macroscopic scale in the form of spherical holes (**Fig. 8**), many of which had become filled, or partially filled, with corrosion products. In addition, gas porosity on a finer scale (microporosity) occurred in most of the coins in the form of spherical holes about $I \mu m$ in diameter associated with the interdendritic constituents, typically the sulphide inclusions; some of this microporosity can be seen in **Figure 7**. Shrinkage porosity was present in all of the coins. In those coins that had ledeburite in the microstructure, the shrinkage porosity was manifest as gaps or irregular holes in the material at ledeburite colony boundaries (**Fig. 8**).

X-radiography clearly revealed the macroscopic (0.1–1 mm diameter) gas porosity in the form of small dark circular markings on the X-ray film (**Fig. 9**). Some coins, notably cm37, displayed very considerable amounts of coarse gas porosity. The porosity in coin cm5 was so extensive in the region where its cross-section was sampled that the coin appeared to be hollow; this was also visible in the radiograph. In this case the porosity was too great to be due to either shrinkage or gas, and is attributed to liquid metal feeding problems during the casting process, either because of poor mould gating system design, inadequate pouring temperature or some inadvertent restriction on metal flow into the mould.

Corrosion was also visible in most of the microstructures, having penetrated from the surface into the interiors of the coins

Figure 2 Fully ledeburitic microstructure (cm31). Nital etch. Scale bar 50 microns

Figure 3 Microstructure of ledeburite with 10% proeutectic pearlite (cm32).The pearlite appears dark but close examination shows it to be lamellar ferrite and cementite. Nital etch. Scale bar 50 microns

Figure 4 Microstructure of ledeburite with 25% proeutectic pearlite (cm29). Nital etch. Scale bar 50 microns

Figure 5 Microstructure of ledeburite with 20% proeutectic cementite in the form of laths (cm24). Nital etch. Scale bar 50 microns

Figure 6 Divorced eutectic microstructure with 50% proeutectic pearlite dendrites in a cementite matrix (cm12). Nital etch. Scale bar 50 microns

Figure 7 Divorced eutectic microstructure with 75% proeutectic pearlite dendrites in a cementite matrix (cm10). Nital etch. Scale bar 50 microns

Figure 8 Ledeburitic microstructure with proeutectic cementite, showing gas porosity (spherical voids) as well as shrinkage porosity (dark irregular voids between ledeburite colonies) (cm28). Nital etch. Scale bar 50 microns

Figure 9 X-radiographs of four coins showing variable degrees of casting porosity. Clockwise from upper left cm26, cm27, cm29, cm28

Figure 10 Corroded microstructure at the edge of a coin (cm11). The cementite remains white while the ferrite has corroded and now appears grey. Unetched. Scale bar 100 microns

(**Fig. 10**), sometimes reaching or surpassing the midpoint of the cross-section. The pearlite constituent was attacked preferentially by the corrosion (i.e. pearlite was anodic in the corrosion reaction), so that the as-polished (i.e. unetched) surface of the corroded area showed surface relief with the cementite standing proud (the corrosion products having been spalled from the surface during grinding and polishing). Hence the microstructure could be clearly seen and identified in corroded areas even without etching. The corrosion of the pearlite, especially in the ledeburitic constituent, also created high stress concentrations in the corroded area making the coins more susceptible to fracture, thus it was necessary to use extra care in handling the most heavily corroded coins. As corrosion progressed further, the cementite also corroded; at this stage the sulphide particles and sometimes traces of relict cementite could be discerned within the corrosion products. Where corrosion was severe no vestiges of the original microstructure remained.

Discussion

Early examples of cast iron, white, mottled or grey, are found only rarely outside China, and then usually either as apparently inadvertent products of bloomery furnace operation or as intermediate furnace products, i.e. pig iron intended for conversion into wrought iron. In China, however, cast iron tools and agricultural implements became common from about the mid-1st millennium bc. ⁷ Chinese cast iron coinage appeared at least as early as the Han period, but only became commonplace between the 11th and 13th centuries AD. In some respects, white cast iron is an appropriate material for coins, at least for cast coins, since it is hard, has good wear resistance in the as-cast condition, and has acceptable casting properties, particularly when its phosphorus content is high. Furthermore, and most importantly, it is economically attractive, especially in comparison with other common coinage alloys such as bronze. Although white cast iron is a brittle material, the coins can be made with a thickness sufficient to keep applied stresses acceptably low, so that fracture in service should not normally be a problem. On the other hand white cast iron has comparatively high levels of solidification shrinkage, thus it reproduces mould features relatively poorly.

The elemental compositions of the coins reported in **Table 2** were not unexpected. All of the analysed elements, in conjunction with cooling rate, play major roles in determining

the characteristics of the cast iron. The coins displayed an appreciable range of carbon contents, from about 2.3% to 4.9%, close to the full range normally associated with cast irons. Significant variability was also found in the contents of silicon, phosphorus and sulphur in these coins, with maxima for the three elements at 0.78%Si, 1.65%P and 2.05%S. These compositions explain why all the observed microstructures were those of white cast iron. At similar cooling rates, white cast iron is formed in irons that have low values of Si and C and high values of S. None of the coins fell into a composition range where grey cast iron would have been expected. For example, iron containing carbon above 3%, silicon above 1% and sulphur below 0.1% would be expected to solidify as grey cast iron, but none of these coins came close to such a composition; none had silicon contents high enough to cause the formation of grey cast iron, and those with even moderate silicon contents also contained sufficient sulphur to more than compensate for the silicon. Their compositions suggest that even at unrealistically slow cooling rates it is highly unlikely that any of these coins would have solidified as grey cast iron.

It is clear from **Table 2** that in a general way the coins could be divided into two groups, one group of 17 coins having more than 1.2% total $(P+Si+S)$ and the other group of 20 coins having less than 0.7% total (P+Si+S). In addition, although there was a slight overlap, the carbon contents of the two groups were also different, with the first group having an average carbon content lower than that of the second. This inverse relationship with carbon content is not unexpected because silicon, phosphorus and sulphur all lower the solubility of carbon in liquid iron.

The grouping of the coins based on elemental composition, as described in the preceding paragraph, was found to correspond almost exactly with the two groups based on microstructures.

Figure 11 Iron-iron carbide (cementite) metastable phase diagram; adapted from Hansen & Anderko 1958, 354

Table 2 Coin compositions and microstructures

Notes: nd = not detected; * carbon content estimated as described in text

All of the 19 coins with total $(P+Si+S)$ contents below 0.5% had ledeburitic microstructures, while the 16 coins with high values of (P+Si+S) content all had divorced eutectic microstructures. The two coins that were observed to have mixed microstructures, i.e. ledeburite together with divorced eutectic, were intermediate between the two groups on the basis of elemental composition as well as on the basis of microstructure. The origins of these types of microstructure will now be explained and then the two coin groups can be discussed further.

Explanation of observed microstructures

The microstructural characteristics of the Song coins can be explained with reference to the Fe–Fe₃C equilibrium phase diagram (**Fig. 11**). According to this diagram, when a molten iron-carbon alloy containing 4.3% carbon (the eutectic composition) solidifies under equilibrium (slow) cooling conditions it should transform at the eutectic temperature, 1150° C, to a two-phase eutectic mixture of cementite (Fe₂C) and austenite (γ -iron) known as ledeburite. Ledeburite is not strictly lamellar, as are many eutectic microconstituents, but rather it consists of plates of cementite interspersed with branched linear arrays of austenite whose branches often run at high angles to the direction of growth of the ledeburite colony. Furthermore these branches do not fill the entire space between the

cementite plates, but some cementite infill forms along with the austenite branches, resulting in the distinctive ledeburite morphology. On continued slow cooling, the solid austenite rejects carbon, so that the amount of cementite increases, via the growth of pre-existing cementite as well as, possibly, the precipitation of cementite plates within austenite grains. On cooling through the eutectoid temperature (725°C) the remaining austenite transforms to pearlite, creating the final microstructure since no further changes are expected during further cooling to ambient temperature. This is the simplest form of the microstructure referred to here as ledeburitic, which is exemplified by **Figure 2**.

Cooling of liquid cast irons with carbon slightly below the eutectic composition causes the formation of proeutectic austenite dendrites in the liquid, with the remaining liquid transforming to ledeburite as described above when the eutectic temperature is reached. Subsequent cooling towards 725ºC under equilibrium conditions then causes the rejection of carbon by the austenite, and thus an increase in the amount of cementite as described above. After the remaining austenite transforms to pearlite at 725ºC, the final microstructure consists of pearlite dendrites in a background matrix of ledeburite. The microstructures of coins with lower carbon contents would exhibit larger amounts of proeutectic dendrites in a ledeburite

Wayman and Wang

Table 3 Details of coin microstructures

Notes: cm1, 4 and 5 were sectioned. In cm1 the rim (R) and cross-section (X) showed different microstructures. In cm4 and cm5 there were no differences. * = on colony boundaries

matrix as shown in **Figures 3 and 4**. Coins with slightly more than the eutectic carbon content would solidify in the same way except that the proeutectic phase would be cementite, which is present as plates rather than dendrites as shown in **Figure 5**. This provides an explanation for the observed microstructures of the ledeburitic group of coins.

The description of solidification outlined in the previous paragraphs is normal for alloy systems, but another possibility exists, the formation of so-called 'divorced eutectic' microstructures. These are more likely to form at compositions well above or well below the eutectic composition, and are encouraged by slower cooling rates. In the solidification of white cast irons with well below 4.3%C, the phase diagram (**Fig. 11**) predicts that significant amounts of proeutectic austenite dendrites will form in the liquid so that when the eutectic temperature is reached a relatively small amount of liquid remains between these dendrites. At the eutectic temperature this eutectic liquid freezes, but rather than this happening by the formation of austenite and cementite in the form of ledeburite, the austenite phase of the eutectic solidifies on the pre-existing austenite dendrites, causing them to grow, while the eutectic cementite precipitates in the interdendritic spaces. Hence

instead of obtaining the intimately intergrown austenite and cementite mixture of phases (ledeburite), the austenite and cementite form separately (i.e. 'divorced' from each other).

As in the ledeburitic coins, subsequent cooling under equilibrium conditions from the eutectic temperature down to the eutectoid temperature (725°C) would be expected to cause some of the austenite to transform to cementite, hence the cementite in the interdendritic spaces would be expected to grow. This was observed, with significant amounts of cementite plates being present. At the eutectoid temperature, the remaining austenite transforms to pearlite, resulting in the microstructures observed (**Figs 6 and 7**).

Although not observed in any of the coins examined here, divorced eutectic microstructures can also form at hypereutectic compositions. In this case solidification occurs by the formation of proeutectic cementite plates, with the eutectic constituents again forming separately at the eutectic temperature. In this case the eutectic cementite forms on the proeutectic plates, causing their growth, and also as interdendritic laths. At the same time the austenite forms in the interdendritic spaces but not coupled with the cementite, as it is in ledeburite. Again the austenite transforms to pearlite on subsequent cooling, so that

the final microstructure is a matrix of pearlite enclosing cementite plates. Examples of this process, hypereutectic white cast irons with divorced eutectic microstructures (ie with proeutectic cementite), have been observed in other ancient Chinese cast irons.⁸

Discussion of microstructures

With this background, the observed coin microstructures can be considered in more detail. Clearly the elemental compositions will have been important in determining the microstructures, and in fact a causal relationship can be seen to exist between the elemental compositions of the coins and their type of microstructure, i.e. ledeburitic *v* divorced eutectics. As described above, divorced eutectics are more likely to form when the amount of proeutectic phase is large, i.e. when the carbon content is far below or far above the eutectic. This was in fact observed, as the average carbon content of the divorced eutectic coins (**Table 2**) was found to be 3.2%, whereas the average for the ledeburitic coins was 4.2%. However, it is apparent from **Table 2** that there were a few exceptions to this trend, with several coins exhibiting divorced eutectic microstructures despite having carbon contents which were relatively high (relatively close to the eutectic composition), in conflict with expectation. The determining factor in these cases is likely to be their high phosphorus contents, as phosphorus is known to stimulate divorced eutectic microstructures in hypoeutectic white cast irons such as these.⁹ The coins with divorced eutectic microstructures were all observed to have phosphorus contents above 0.58%. It is of interest in this regard to consider the microstructures of coins having the same carbon content but different phosphorus contents. Here again the results support the role of phosphorus in stimulating the divorced eutectic microstructures. For example, cm12 and cm25 both have nearly the same carbon contents however the higher phosphorus coin (cm12: 0.58%P) has a divorced eutectic microstructure while cm25, with its low (less than the detection limit) phosphorus content, is ledeburitic.

The effects of the sulphur and silicon contents on the formation of divorced eutectic microstructures in cast iron do not seem to have been reported in the literature, because both of these elements were present in the coins at levels well above the ranges exhibited by modern cast irons. It is certainly possible that one or both of these elements could complement the carbon content in stimulating the formation of the divorced eutectic. The correlation between high sulphur content and a divorced eutectic microstructure (**Table 2**) is particularly striking, with the ledeburitic microstructures having a maximum of 0.31%S and the divorced eutectics a minimum of 0.37%S (again with the exception of the mixed-microstructure coin cm11, discussed below). It is possible that along with the lower carbon and higher phosphorus contents, the higher levels of sulphur could be a factor in the development of divorced eutectic microstructures. A similar effect was noted in a group of Chinese white cast iron statuary dating from the 9th to the 19th centuries $AD.¹⁰$

Two of the coins exhibited microstructures that included both ledeburite and divorced eutectic components, being in a transition state between the two microstructural groups. One of these, coin cm11, had a ledeburitic microstructure which was not as clearly defined as the other ledeburitic structures, its

appearance suggesting that it was close to the transition between ledeburite and a divorced eutectic. This is consistent with its composition, as its carbon content was low compared to the other ledeburitic coins, while its silicon, phosphorus and especially sulphur contents were low compared to the other divorced eutectic coins. The case of coin cm4 was comparable in that it was mainly a divorced eutectic but contained a small amount of ledeburite, consistent with its combination of relatively high carbon, relatively low phosphorus and relatively high sulphur.

Few analyses have been reported on other Chinese cast irons of similar or earlier date,¹¹ but those which do exist compare well with the compositions and microstructures of these coins. Furthermore, work currently in progress is yielding results that are also in accord with these.¹²

Smelting conditions

It is of interest to consider the extent to which the characteristics of these coins can be interpreted to yield information about the iron smelting technology. One important aspect is the question of whether the iron in these coins was smelted using coal or coke as opposed to charcoal to provide the high temperatures and reducing atmospheres needed for blast furnace operation. Although the use of mineral fuels in iron smelting was not successfully achieved in Europe until the early 18th century AD, it is clear that coal or coke was being used for smelting iron in Song times, and there are suggestions of much earlier use.¹³

Wagner has given direct consideration to the dates at which coal or coke came into relatively widespread use in iron smelting, based to some extent on early writings but also quoting the results of scientific examinations by others.¹⁴ He quotes a text reference from the 4th century AD which seems to refer to the use of coal in iron smelting, though it is important to note that the use of coal or coke in metallurgy for purposes such as heating of annealing furnaces or baking moulds may well have preceded their use in blast furnaces by many centuries.¹⁵ Wagner also points out that very many such references suddenly appeared in writings of Song times. Since this was a time of serious wood shortage,¹⁶ an increased emphasis on the use of mineral fuel is not surprising. On the question of which of the mineral fuels, coal or coke, was being used, Wagner points out that coke has been used in China since very early times, and Hartwell and Golas refer to the specific use of coke in iron smelting during the Song period.¹⁷

The scientific evidence for the use of coal or coke referred to by Wagner includes three radiocarbon analyses obtained by Qiu Shihua and Cai Lianzhen from Song/Yuan cast iron objects which gave dates ranging between 11,500 and 14,000 years BP.¹⁸ Wagner notes that these are far too early to be possible valid dates *per se*, and suggests that they could result from a mix of charcoal and coke/coal in the smelting furnace, although such mixed fuels are not otherwise attested. Alternative explanations for these dates without invoking the use of mineral fuel include the use of a carbonate mineral such as limestone in the flux, or possibly the use of iron carbonate ore (the carbon present in coal and in carbonates are both infinitely old from a radiocarbon perspective). However the most likely explanation for the dates is that the objects could have been cast from a second furnace in which charcoal smelted iron and coal/coke smelted iron had been remelted together. It is becoming more evident that

Wayman and Wang

attempts to apply radiocarbon dating to the carbon present in ferrous materials have the potential to yield erroneous results for a variety of reasons.¹⁹

The other scientific evidence for the use of coal or coke referred to by Wagner is the presence of sulphur in cast iron artefacts.²⁰ Many coals contain appreciable amounts of sulphur, most of which remains after its transformation to coke, whereas charcoal contains little or no sulphur. The smelting conditions in early blast furnaces are likely to cause the majority of this sulphur to end up in the cast iron. The most simplistic approach would therefore be to say that high sulphur content in the cast iron can be identified with a coal- or coke-burning blast furnace, whereas low sulphur content is indicative of charcoal smelted iron. This argument has been used frequently, for example by Rostoker and Bronson and also by Han Rubin who interprets a positive response to a sulphur print as evidence for the use of coal.²¹

Unfortunately, this type of argument is complicated by a number of other factors. One is that sulphur is also a constituent of some iron ores, in the form of the mineral pyrite (iron sulphide) that could contribute sulphur to the cast iron even if the iron was charcoal-smelted, although roasting of the ore prior to smelting is likely to drive off most of this sulphur. Another factor, probably of more importance, is that some coals have intrinsically low sulphur contents, so that iron smelted with these coals would not acquire high levels of sulphur. For example, if coal or coke use results in higher smelting temperatures (see below), more sulphur can be transferred to the slag phase, especially if limestone is used as a flux. This would be expected to give a sulphur level lower than in iron smelted with coke at lower temperatures, however still higher than in charcoal-smelted iron. For these reasons it cannot be said with absolute confidence that a high sulphur content in the iron is proof that the iron was smelted with coal (coke) or that low sulphur iron comes from smelting with charcoal.

However, a review of the results of previously reported chemical analyses of charcoal- and coke-smelted cast irons from early (pre-4th century AD) China and from early European blast furnace products²² shows that although charcoal-smelted iron almost always displays low sulphur contents, i.e. below 0.1%S, and coke-smelted irons are normally well above 0.1%S, some coke-smelted cast irons do display low sulphur levels, as low as 0.05%S. On the other hand, of all of the charcoal-smelted cast irons analysed, none had sulphur levels much above 0.1% and only one was above 0.2%S, which confirms that the use of highsulphur iron ore was not common. Thus the empirical evidence is that although a low sulphur content cannot be considered as absolute proof of the use of charcoal in iron smelting, a high sulphur content is in fact strongly indicative of the use of mineral fuel, i.e. coal or coke.

Discussion of composition

The question of furnace temperature is one that can be addressed by considering the results of the coin analyses since high silicon and manganese contents of cast iron are potential indicators of high furnace temperature. Silicon enters the ironsmelting furnace in the gangue (waste) material associated with the ore minerals, as well as being a constituent of the furnacelining materials. The gangue, along with reacted furnace linings and fuel ash, becomes the smelting slag, and silicon partitions

between metal and slag, with more silicon reduced into the metal at higher smelting temperatures. Once again, the choice of fuel plays a role. Since coal- or coke-fired furnaces can be expected to operate at higher temperatures than charcoal-fired furnaces,²³ the argument could be made that high-silicon cast irons are more likely to have been coal- or coke-smelted. However, many variables other than the fuel are involved in determining furnace temperature, notably furnace size and air blowing rate. Charcoal-fired blast furnaces can in fact be operated under conditions such that they achieve temperatures high enough to produce high-silicon cast iron.

It is of course a reasonable possibility that the iron used to make some of the coins was coke-smelted while other coins were made of charcoal-smelted iron. (In the Japanese coin analysed in the preliminary work, the iron, which was undoubtedly the product of a charcoal-fired furnace, was found to have low sulphur content). As iron smelting using coal or coke was becoming much more common during the Song dynasty, the time when these particular coins were produced, it could be expected that both charcoal- and coal/coke-fired furnaces might have been in use at the same time, possibly even in the same geographic region at the same time. Furthermore, it is not impossible that some smelting furnaces were fired using mixtures of charcoal with coal or coke, and it is even more likely that in many if not all cases the coins were cast from remelting furnaces where coal-smelted and coke-smelted irons could have been mixed. Consequently, the wide range of silicon and sulphur contents observed in the coins is not surprising.

The other elements of interest are carbon, phosphorus and manganese. Carbon is reduced from the charcoal or coal (coke), and higher furnace temperatures along with more strongly reducing conditions are expected to yield a higher carbon content in the iron product if no other variables are considered. However higher furnace temperatures reduce more silicon and phosphorus into the iron, and these lower the carbon content of the liquid iron. In line with this, the coins with higher silicon and phosphorus contents were found in general to have slightly lower carbon contents than the low silicon-phosphorus coins. Phosphorus in cast iron normally originates in the iron ore, where phosphorus-bearing minerals are present along with the iron-bearing minerals. During smelting, the phosphorus dissolves in both the metallic iron and the silicate smelting slag but in general most of the phosphorus is expected to enter the metal. The variability of the phosphorus content in the coins presumably reflects some combination of higher furnace temperatures and the use of different iron ores, although slag conditions also affect the partition.

The higher furnace temperature would also be expected to reduce some manganese into the iron, provided that manganese is present in the ore, and hence the absence of detectable manganese in most of these coins suggests that low-manganese ores were smelted and/or that smelting temperatures were low. The iron in the one coin with a detectable manganese content, cm11, is likely to have been smelted from a different ore in comparison with the other coins; its silicon content was too low to be indicative of a high smelting temperature.

Another question which remains unanswered is whether the coins were cast into the coin moulds directly from a smelting (blast) furnace or from a remelting (e.g. cupola-type) furnace where iron, possibly iron that had originally been smelted in

different furnaces and now in the form of pig iron and/or scrap, was melted together. Information obtained from these analyses does not shed light on this question. Although casting conditions can be better controlled from a remelting furnace, casting directly from a blast furnace has long been a common technique, for example most post-medieval European cast iron cannon were cast in this manner.²⁴ On the other hand, during Song times at least some iron used for coins was smelted elsewhere than at the mint sites, for example locally in payment of taxes, and delivered to the mint sites where it would necessarily have been remelted for casting into coins.²⁵

Geographical and chronological differences

With the above thoughts in mind, it is of interest to consider the geographical origins of the Song coins analysed in this study. Mint locations are known for 23 of the 37 coins (**Table 4**). On the basis of the mint marks, 6 of the 23 coins were minted in modern-day Shaanxi province, north-central China, while the other 17 were minted in different mints: at Qichun (9 coins); Tong'an (6 coins); and Hanyang (2 coins). These three named mints were in the Song administrative departments of Qizhou, Shuzhou and Ezhou, respectively, and are located in modernday Hubei and Anhui provinces, about 1,000 km to the southeast of Shaanxi (**Fig. 12**). These two different locations correspond with the two main areas where iron coins were circulated: Sichuan/Shaanxi and the Hubei/Anhui region, respectively.

Recent work relating to Song dynasty coins indicates that Qichun was close to modern-day Qichun, Hubei; Tong'an to

Table 4 Coins with mint marks

modern-day Shucheng, Anhui; and Hanyang to modern-day Wuhan, Hubei. Combining historical texts and archaeological finds, Chen Hao writes that the Qichun mint opened in 1170, was expanded in 1185, and closed *c*. 1236–37.²⁶ Annual production reached 200,000 strings in 1185. The Hanyang mint opened *c*. 1190, and closed after 1232 (its annual production was reckoned together with the Fumin mint, at 200,000 strings in 1212). The Tong'an mint has recently been excavated, and among the finds were remains of poured iron as well as finished and unfinished iron coins of the Daguan (1107–10) and Zhenghe (1111–18) periods. This mint is known from historical records to have been casting iron coins during the period 1099–1214.²⁷ The Tong'an coins analysed here are all from the final 30 years of production.²⁸

It is significant that in terms of composition and microstructure the Shaanxi coins are all similar to each other, being of the type which has high impurity levels and divorced eutectic microstructure, whereas all of the Hubei/Anhui coins are also similar to each other but of the other type, with low impurity contents and ledeburitic microstructures. This suggests that the three Hubei/Anhui mints were using the same or similar ore, the same or similar smelting conditions and that at least some of these parameters were different in the smelters that provided the Shaanxi mint. It is suggested that the difference between the Shaanxi coins and the Hubei/Anhui coins may well be related to the choice of smelting fuel in the different geographical locations, i.e. coal or coke in Shaanxi and charcoal in the Hubei/Anhui region. Coal deposits are

Notes: $nd = not detected; * = estimated, as described in text$

Figure 12 Map of central China showing the locations of the mints discussed, with names of present-day cities in upper case.

concentrated in the more northerly regions of China, including Shaanxi and in Sichuan, and it is known that coal production underwent explosive growth during the Song dynasty, stimulated by a shortage of wood on the north China plain.²⁹ On the other hand the south was much more heavily wooded, and the easy availability of wood meant that charcoal was greatly preferred as a fuel there. It is of interest to note that during the Northern Song period, serious shortages of charcoal in Kaifeng, the Song capital, necessitated the import of charcoal from the south, and a gradual change to coal or coke as a domestic fuel.³⁰ These considerations are fully consistent with the suggestion that the iron used for the Shaanxi coins was smelted with coke and that for the Hubei/Anhui coins with charcoal.

If the coins are considered strictly chronologically, all of the earlier (AD 1078–1125) ones have higher impurity contents and divorced eutectic microstructures, whereas the later (1174–1215) coins, other than those minted during the Chunxi reign period (1174–89), were of the low impurity, ledeburitic type. Of the nine analysed Chunxi period coins, five were in the earlier group and four in the later group. However, of the coins for which mint locations are known, all of the Shaanxi coins are early whereas all of the Hubei/Anhui coins are late, hence it is not possible to separate the effects of geographical location from those of chronology. Furthermore, it must be noted that the time interval between the earlier and later coins is relatively short, a matter of some 50 years. In view of the number of coins analysed here, it does not seem reasonable to draw firm conclusions with respect to the changes over time.

In summary, it can be said that there are great similarities among the coins minted within each of the two geographic

regions, but very significant differences between the coins from the two regions. The sulphur contents of the Hubei/Anhui coins are so low as to suggest strongly that they are made of charcoalsmelted iron. The Shaanxi coins have undoubtedly been smelted from a different ore, but their higher silicon contents suggest higher smelting temperatures, and this in combination with the observed higher sulphur levels suggest strongly that they are likely to have been made of coke-smelted iron.

Coin production and processing

Examination of the microstructures revealed that all of the coins were in the as-cast condition, with no indications that following the casting operations the coins had been subjected to any thermal processing. This is as expected; there is no obvious reason why such heat treatment would be desirable. In the mid-1st millennium bc, Chinese ironworkers learned to heat treat white cast iron in order to decompose the cementite and then precipitate it as agglomerations of graphite, making malleable cast iron,³¹ a process that much improved the toughness of the material (this malleablizing heat treatment did not appear in Europe until the late 17th century AD). Alternatively the heat treatment could remove the carbon from the cast iron without the precipitation of graphite, transforming it into a form of wrought iron or, in some cases, steel. Both of these heat treatments would have degraded the service performance of the coins, and it is not surprising that they were not used.

Some of the coins examined here showed evidence of the casting process by which they were produced, in the form of stubs projecting from the outer rim. These are vestiges of the gating system (sprues and ingates), the channels through which molten iron flowed in to fill the moulds. Because white cast iron is so hard and resistant to deformation, removal of these projections would have been very difficult to accomplish; filing or sawing would not have been possible for example. The hardness and strength of the white cast iron would also have precluded mechanical working, for example by forging or stamping, and, not surprisingly, no evidence of mechanical working was visible in the microstructures of the coins.

Since the coins were produced in large numbers 32 they would certainly have been cast using a high volume production process. It is likely that they were cast in 'trees', complex moulds in which many coins could be cast simultaneously from a central gating system, creating a solid array of branches (the frozen ingates) with a cast coin at the end of each branch.³³ This type of production technique would have been necessary to produce coins at the high rates and volumes required. Bronze coins were often cast directly in bronze moulds, many of which have been found. The moulds for the iron coins could also have been made of metal (permanent moulds) which would likely have survived hundreds of refillings before degrading to the point where they would have had to be replaced.³⁴ As an alternative to metal moulds, tree-type clay or sand moulds could have been utilized. Burger describes the process used for bronze coins. This process starts with 'mother' coins that served as patterns, and involves pressing the mother coins into a mould material such as a mixture of earth (loam) and coal to produce a mould, assembling a number of moulds into a stack and then pouring the casting. Here the mould would be destroyed with each casting, and mould production would be a major part of the casting operation. That the Chinese used this technique for

casting bronze coins is well documented³⁵ and it is likely to have been used for iron coins as well. A related high volume stack moulding system was extensively used for production of iron castings for agricultural tools, hardware, etc.,³⁶ with both metal and clay moulds being employed. The recent report of the excavation of the Tong'an mint site did not mention mould material being found, but did mention pot sherds, porcelain sherds and broken brick from the Song period level.³⁷ After casting, clay coin moulds must be broken open to remove the cast coins, leaving only fragments that could have appeared similar to, and be mistaken for, pot sherds.

The coin microstructures, which have the potential to provide information about cooling rates of the liquid metal during and after freezing, were not revealing in this respect; none of the coins exhibited a chilled surface microstructure of the type which would be expected from rapid cooling. Rapid cooling is normally associated with metal moulds, which have good heat transfer and heat absorption capabilities. However rapid cooling can create problems when casting a small object like a coin, or especially an array of coins cast simultaneously. In these situations it is important to have enough metal flow to fill the mould(s) completely, avoiding premature freezing in the gating system which would block subsequent metal flow. In the case of white cast iron this is a particularly serious problem, more serious than for bronze coins, because the ingates must be relatively slender so that the coins can be readily broken off the 'trees' after solidification (the extreme hardness of white cast iron limits the possible techniques for this detachment). One way to use a metal mould with constricted ingates while avoiding their being blocked by premature freezing, would be to preheat it prior to casting in order to slow the cooling rate. With such preheating, a chilled surface on the coins would not have been expected even if metal moulds had been used. Furthermore, the temperature of the liquid iron prior to casting plays a role in determining cooling rate independently of mould material. Hence it is not surprising that the microstructure of the coin was unable to help determine the material from which the moulds had been made.

Conclusions

All the 37 coins analysed were found to have been made of white cast iron. Based on their compositions, the coins fell into two groups, one with relatively high levels of silicon, phosphorus and sulphur and relatively low carbon contents and the other with relatively low levels of silicon, phosphorus and sulphur and higher carbon contents. These compositional groupings are fully consistent with their microstructures which also fell into two groups, divorced eutectic microstructures in the high impurity low carbon irons, and ledeburitic microstructures in the low impurity high carbon irons. Two coins are intermediate between these two groups, both in composition and in microstructure. The fact that all of the coins are white cast irons is fully consistent with their compositions as they have relatively low silicon contents and many have relatively high levels of sulphur.

Of the 23 coins whose geographical origins are known from mint marks, two general minting areas are represented. Coins minted in Shaanxi were found to be all similar and of the divorced eutectic type. These are quite different from the coins minted in Hubei and Anhui, about 1,000km to the southeast, which are again similar to each other but different from the

Shaanxi coins, being of the ledeburitic type. Although it is not possible to be certain, the cast iron from the Hubei/Anhui region is likely to have been smelted in charcoal-fired blast furnaces, while the iron in the Shaanxi coins is likely to have come from coke-fired blast furnaces. The coins were found to be in the ascast condition, with no evidence of subsequent heat treating or working.

[First published in *Historical Metallurgy* 37, no.1 (2003), 6–24.]

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Dr P.T. Craddock for initiating this project and for support and discussion throughout. They also acknowledge with gratitude the helpful comments of Dr D.B. Wagner.

Notes

- 1 Zhou Weirong, 'Shilun woguo gudai tieqian de qiyuan, *Zhongguo Qianbi* 1999/1, 22–26. [On the origins of iron coinage in ancient China, China Numismatics]. D.B. Wagner, 'Blast furnaces in Song/Yuan China', *East Asian Science, Technology and Medicine* 18 (2001), 41–74.
- 2 Yang Lien-sheng, *Money and Credit in China: a Short History* (Cambridge, Mass, 1952: Harvard-Yenching Institute Monograph series 12). R. Hartwell, 'The evolution of the early Northern Sung monetary system, AD 960-1025', Journal of the American Oriental *Society* 87 (1967), 280–89. R. Von Glahn, *Fountain of Fortune: Money and Monetary Policy in China, 1000–1700* (Berkeley, 1996).
- 3 Peng Xinwei, *Zhongguo Huobi Shi* (Shanghai, 1965). E.H. Kaplan (trans.), *A Monetary History of China,* 2 vols (Western Washington University, 1984: East Asian Research Aids and Translations 5).
- 4 Peng Xinwei, *Zhongguo Huobi Shi*.
- 5 Peng Xinwei, *Zhongguo Huobi Shi*.
- 6 British Museum registration no. 2000-1-5-1.
- 7 D.B. Wagner, *Iron and Steel in Ancient China* (Leiden, 1993). D.B. Wagner, 'The earliest use of iron in China', in S.M.M. Young, A.M. Pollard, P. Budd and R.A. Ixer (eds), *Metals in Antiquity* (Oxford, 1999: BAR International Series 792), 1–9. B. Bronson, 'The transition to iron in ancient China', in V.C. Pigott (ed.), *The Archaeometallurgy of the Asian Old World* (Philadelphia, 1999: MASCA Research Papers in Science and Archaeology 16), 177–93.
- 8 For example, M.L. Wayman, J. Lang and C. Michaelson, The metallurgy of cast iron statuary (forthcoming).
- 9 A.R. Bailey and L.E. Samuels, *Foundry Metallography* [annotated metallographic specimens: special series – studies in technology] (Betchworth, 1971), 129 [as referenced in H. Unglik, *Cast Irons from Les Forges du Saint-Maurice, Quebec: A Metallurgical Study* (Ottawa, 1990: Studies in Archaeology, Architecture and History, National Historic Parks and Sites).]
- 10 Wayman *et al., Metallurgy*.
- 11 For example, M.L. Pinel, T.T. Read and T.A. Wright, 'Composition and microstructure of ancient iron castings', *Transactions of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers*131 (1938), 174–94. G.W. Henger, 'The metallography and chemical analysis of iron-base samples dating from antiquity to modern times', *Historical Metallurgy* 4(2) (1970), 45–52; erratum 5(1) (1971), 11. W. Rostoker, B. Bronson and J. Dvorak, 'The cast iron bells of China', *Technology and Culture* 25 (1984), 750–67. D.B. Wagner, 'Chinese monumental iron castings', *Journal of East Asian Archaeology* 2(3/4) (2000), 199–224. Also, tabulated data from Chinese sources in W. Rostoker and B. Bronson, *Pre-industrial Iron* (Philadelphia, 1990: Archeomaterials monograph 1), tables 10.3–10.4; D.B. Wagner, *Iron and Steel*, table 7.1 and B. Bronson, *Transition to Iron*, table 7.4.
- 12 Wayman*et al., Metallurgy*.
- 13 T.T. Read, 'The earliest industrial use of coal', *Transactions of the Newcomen Society* 20 (1939–40), pp. 119–33. R. Hartwell, 'Markets, technology and the structure of enterprise in the development of 11th century Chinese iron and steel industry', *Journal of Economic History* 26(1) (1966), 29–58, esp. 55. R. Hartwell, 'A cycle of economic change in imperial China: Coal and iron in northeast China 750–1350', *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*10 (1967), 102–59, esp. 118. B. Till and P. Swart, 'Cast iron statuary of China', *Orientations* (August 1993), 40–45, esp. 40. P.J. Golas,

Wayman and Wang

'Mining', in J. Needham (ed.), *Science and Civilization in China* 5 (XIII) (Cambridge, 1999). Wagner, 'Blast furnaces'.

- 14 Wagner, 'Blast furnaces'*;* see also*Historical Metallurgy* 37(1) (2003), 25–77.
- 15 Han Rubin, 'The development of Chinese ancient iron blast furnace', *Forum for the 4th International Conference on the Beginning of the Use of Metals and Alloys (BUMA-IV)* (Shimane, Japan, 1996), 151–74, esp. 152.
- 16 Hartwell, 'Cycle of economic change'.
- 17 R. Hartwell, Iron and early industrialism in eleventh-century China. (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Chicago, 1963), 69–70. [as referenced by Wagner, 'Blast furnaces']. Hartwell, 'Markets, technology and the structure of enterprise', 55–57. Golas, 'Mining', 196.
- 18 Wagner 'Blast furnaces'. Qiu Shihua and Cai Lianzhen, 'Woguo gudai yetie ranliao de tan-shisi jianding' [Use of radiocarbon dating to determine the fuel used in ancient Chinese iron-smelting], in Wang Zhongshu and An Zhimin (eds), *Zhongguo Kaoguxue Yanjiu* (Beijing, 1986), 359–63.
- 19 P.T. Craddock, M.L. Wayman and T. Jull, 'The radiocarbon dating and authentication of iron artefacts', *Radiocarbon* (in press).
- 20 Wagner, 'Blast furnaces'.
- 21 Rostoker and Bronson, *Pre-industrial Iron*. Han Rubin, 'Development of Chinese ancient iron blast furnace', 154.
- 22 R. Evrard and A. Descy, *Histoire de l'Usine des Vennes* (Liège, 1948) [as referenced in Rostoker and Bronson, *Pre-industrial Iron*]. Henger, 'Metallurgy and chemical analysis'. R.F. Tylecote, *A History of Metallurgy* (London, 1976). R.F. Tylcote, 'Iron in the Industrial Revolution', in J. Day and R.F. Tylecote (eds), *The Industrial Revolution in Metals* (London, 1991). C.W. Pfannenschmidt, *Die Anwendung des Holzkohlenhochofens seit Ende des 16 Jahrhunderts zur Erzeugung von Gusswaren Erster Schmeltzung und die Spatere Zweite Schmelzung in Flamm-und Kupolofen bis Mitte des 19 Jahrhunderts* (Dusseldorf, 1977: Verein Deutscher Eisenhuttenleute Fachausschuss-bericht 9.007) [as referenced in Rostoker and Bronson 1990]. Rostoker and Bronson , *Pre-industrial iron*. Wagner, *Iron and steel*. Bronson, 'The transition to iron'.
- 23 J.E. Rehder, 'The change from charcoal to coke in iron smelting', *Historical Metallurgy* 21 (1987), 37–43.
- 24 W. Rostoker, 'Troubles with cast iron cannon', *Archeomaterials*1 (1086) , 60–00.
- 25 R. Hartwell, 'A revolution in the Chinese iron and coal industries during the Northern Sung, 960–1126 ad', *Journal of Asian Studies* 21 (1962), 153–62.
- 26 Chen Hao, 'Jiangbei tieqian jian ruogan wenti tansuo', *Zhongguo Qianbi* 2002/1, 11–16. [On the iron coin mints of the Jiangbei region, *China Numismatics*.]
- 27 Jin Xiaochun, Jiang Yonghu, Cheng Jianzhong and Yang Jianxin, 'Anhui Huaining Shankou zhencun zhuqian yizhi ji Tong'an jian zhi kaocha', *Zhongguo Qianbi* 2000/3, 44–45. [An investigation of the Tong'an mint site at Shankou zhencun, Huaining, Anhui province, *China Numismatics*.]
- 28 Two Chinese publications on Song dynasty iron coins should provide further details of these and other mints: Liu Sen, *Zhongguo tie qian* [*Iron coinage in China*] (Beijing, 1997); and Yan Fushan (ed.), *Liang Song tie qian* [*Iron coinage of the Northern and Southern Song*] (Xi'an, 2001). For further reference to the Shaanxi mints, see Wang Shengduo, 'Shaanxi zhuqianjian kao', *Zhongguo Qianbi*1998/1, 1–8. [The mints of Shaanxi, *China Numismatics*.]
- 29 Golas, 'Mining'. 30 Hartwell, 'Cycle of economic change'.
- 31 D.B. Wagner, *Toward the Reconstruction of Ancient Chinese Techniques for the Production of Malleable Cast Iron* (Copenhagen, 1989: East Asian Institute Occasional Paper 4).
- 32 Peng Xinwei, *Zhongguo Huobi shi*.
- 33 W. Burger, *Ch'ing Cash until 1735* (Taipei, 1976).
- 34 W. Rostoker, B. Bronson, J. Dvorak and G. Shen, 'Casting farm implements, comparable tools and hardware in ancient China', *World Archaeology* 15(2) (1983), 196–210.
- 35 For example, Burger, *Ch'ing cash*; and J. Williams (ed.), *Money a History* (London, 1997), 141.
- 36 Rostoker *et al.*, 'Casting farm implements'; Hua Jue-ming, 'The mass production of iron castings in ancient China', *Scientific American* 248 (1983), 107–14; Li Jinghua, 'The excavation and study of iron smelting sites in Henan of Han dynasty, China', *Bulletin of the Metals Museum* 25 (1996), 14–35.
- 37 Jin *et al.*, 'Anhui Huaining'.

Metal Supply for the Metropolitan Coinage of the Kangxi Period (1662–1721) Michael Cowell and Helen Wang

In common with many coin series, the Chinese copper-alloy cash has not escaped the attention of the scientist. The chemical composition of coins within a series can provide useful technological information on metal production and supply over time. As the cash coinage was produced over 2,000 years, by a very consistent technology, it can provide an extensive database for this purpose, indicating the typical metal stocks and alloys available for manufacturing other Chinese copper-based, particularly cast, metalwork. Two groups have conducted analytical surveys of the series, which yielded very similar results, although different analytical techniques were used.¹ They showed that the coinage was essentially made of leaded tin bronze until the 16th century when there was a complete change to brass.

The first brass (or zinc-containing) coins occur as a minority within the otherwise bronze issues during the later Hongzhi period $(1503-05)^2$ but from Jiajing $(1527-69)$ most of the coins were made of brass,³ the officially prescribed alloy.⁴ Initially, until the mid-17th century, the brass is not a simple copper-zinc alloy but contains substantial amounts of lead and some tin. Some of this may have been introduced in the form of scrap bronze although the amounts of lead and tin were sometimes officially prescribed⁵ and were therefore presumably added as individual metals. There has been some debate⁶ about how the brass was manufactured, either by the cementation (calamine) process or by speltering, adding metallic zinc to copper.⁷ This is an interesting aspect as it may indicate when metallic zinc production commenced in China. The 17th-century Chinese technological treatise, *Tian gong kai wu* of 1637,⁸ clearly refers to metallic zinc and its manufacture. On the basis of an entry in the *Ming Shi* which may indicate the addition of metallic zinc, Cowell *et al.* have suggested that speltering was used for the earliest 16th-century coin issues containing zinc,⁹ and supported this with analytical evidence. Zhou Weirong and Fan Xiangxi¹⁰ dispute this however, maintaining that the item refers only to the addition of tin. The high zinc content of the coins, coupled with relatively high amounts of lead and tin, clearly indicate that during the Wanli period (1576–1621) at the latest, the brass was made by speltering.¹¹ There is also a report of a zinc slab ingot with an inscription dating it to 1585 from Lianzhou, Guangdong province.¹² Evidence for earlier manufacture remains uncertain.

Cowell *et al.* had noted temporal variations in the trace element composition of the brass coins which were thought to be related to the metal source or production processes.¹³ For example, there was a sudden, and sustained, increase in the amount of cadmium (a metal associated with zinc) in the coins dating from 1621 onwards which, it was thought, may have been caused by a change in the method of zinc production or the source of its ores.¹⁴ Somewhat later than this, during the Kangxi period (1662–1721), there were systematic changes in a number of other trace elements, especially nickel, antimony, arsenic and

cobalt which generally decreased in concentration and remained low until the later Qianlong period $(1735-95)$.¹⁵ It was suggested that this was the result of an influx of imported copper from Japan which was thought to have occurred at this time; the purpose of this note is to examine this connection in more detail through the presentation of new analytical data on Japanese ingots and contemporary Chinese coins.

From 1646 copper became a regular import from Japan, stimulated in the 1650s by European and, later, Chinese demand for the metal. The key traders of Japanese copper were the Dutch and Chinese, and most of the metal remained in the east: until 1666 the bulk was taken first to Taiwan¹⁶ for redistribution, thereafter to Malacca. The steep rise in the price of Japanese copper in the 1660s was based on increasing Dutch demand and Japan's own domestic need for copper. After the 1660s Japanese production of copper expanded and could meet the demands of the Dutch and the Chinese.¹⁷

There was apparently free trade in Japan until 1672, when the Japanese introduced regulated trade. Free prices (previously determined by an auction system) were replaced by fixed prices, regulated by a joint Japanese-Dutch-Chinese council. The regulated trade continued until 1685 when prices were free again. Apart from a short interruption 1698–99, the volume of trade was fixed: the Dutch were allowed to sell goods up to a limit of 300,000 Japanese taels of silver, and the Chinese up to a limit of 600,000 taels of silver. In 1715 a system of regulation was re-introduced.¹⁸ The copper trade was highly profitable, estimated at one point to account for 80% of the Dutch East India Company (Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie, 'VOC' trade).¹⁹ At first, the Dutch had a virtual monopoly; they exported from Japan not only copper bars (the cheapest form of refined copper), but also copper alloy coins – almost 27 million coins in 1665 and almost 24 million coins in 1666.²⁰

Chinese competition in the copper trade developed primarily in the hands of private merchants. The new Qing government had inherited the Ming policy of absolute exclusion against the Japanese, however the Japanese Tokugawa government had been actively encouraging Chinese merchants since the early years of the 17th century. By 1657 the Dutch court in Batavia was irritated by the competition, and instructed the VOC factory in Japan to try to put obstacles in the way of the Chinese buying up copper, as Chinese merchants had in 1656 conveyed some 17,000–18,000 piculs of copper to Batavia.²¹ The irritation was further compounded by the fact that this copper was sold on to private traders and carried on VOC ships to Coromandel, Surat and Persia, thus stinging Dutch business there as well.²²

The Chinese needed copper for minting coins. In 1644 the Qing government had set up two mints in the capital: the Board of Revenue and Board of Works, with an annual copper consumption of 22,000–24,000 piculs. The procurement of the

Cowell and Wang

necessary copper was in the charge of the Interior Revenue Offices (*neidi shuiguan*) in Zhili, Shandong, Jiangsu, Jiangxi and Zhejiang provinces. These offices used government funds to purchase copper from private merchants. During the 1650s and 1660s both the central and provincial mints were very active, and by the 1670s there was a serious shortage of copper. The provincial mints were shut down, and in 1673 severe penalties were placed on the use of copper for domestic purposes. In 1675 the operation of the various Chinese mints was reorganised, with the aim of increasing production, and orders were issued to buy in scrap copper. On the grounds that Chinese sea power was initially in the control of anti-Manchu forces, such as Zheng Chenggong's fleets, Hall suggests that for the first 40 years of operation the Qing mints were probably forced to subsist on domestic copper.²³

Competition from the Chinese was so strong that in 1683–84 the Dutch planned a major project: to buy up all the Japanese copper intended for export. A proposition was made to the Japanese government for taking over 50,000–60,000 piculs of copper at a suggested price, with a contract to be binding for three to four years. The Japanese refused.²⁴ By the late 1680s, the Chinese were exporting more copper bars, scrap copper and copper plate than the Dutch, and by 1684 the VOC gave permission to the Chinese merchants in Batavia and Bantam to trade with Japan, on the ground that they had in fact been carrying on this trade for many years already.²⁵

The year 1684 was a turning point: China's sea frontiers officially opened, and the Kangxi emperor ordered the Amoy and Fujian authorities to load ships with silk and sugar for Japan. In the 1680s and 1690s large numbers of Chinese trading vessels entered Nagasaki,²⁶ and the sudden growth of trade resulted in a heavy loss of Japanese silver and copper coins. In 1685 the Japanese limited the volume of trade permitted with China to 600,000 taels of silver, and stopped all export of specie, silver and copper, specifying that only merchandise could be removed. However, refined copper, in bulk, was categorised as merchandise. In 1699 copper procurement in China became the responsibility of the Imperial Household Dept (*neiwu fu*), in order that the government might exercise greater control over copper. Hall notes that by this time, Chinese mints were exclusively using Japanese copper, and suggests this may have been the case soon after 1684.²⁷

That the changes in the composition of the Chinese coins can be explained by contemporaneous imports of Japanese copper is given strong support by recent analyses of contemporary Japanese copper ingots²⁸ and comparisons with the cash coinage.

Cowell *et al*. analysed a number of coins by X-ray fluorescence (XRF) and atomic absorption spectrometry (AAS) from the period of interest.²⁹ These included 16 coins of the Kangxi reign which were categorised into three chronological groups ('early', 'middle', and 'late') according to the arrangement devised by Burger, based on historical sources, calligraphy and size.³⁰ There were also analyses of the immediately preceding issues of Shunzhi (1644–61) and the succeeding issues of Yongzheng (1723–35) and Qianlong (1736–95). The data are reproduced and summarised in Appendix 1. It can be seen that the 'early' issues differ from the other Kangxi issues in alloy as well as trace elements. Thus, they have lower zinc, and higher lead and tin, and most of the trace elements are higher. Furthermore, there is continuity with the preceeding and

succeeding issues until the later period of Qianlong when the trace elements return to higher concentrations. The data for the alloying elements (Zn, Sn, Pb) and some of the trace elements (Sb, As, Ni) are summarised chronologically in **Figures 1 and 2**, respectively.

The date of the transition from 'early' to 'middle' Kangxi types may be deduced from the alloy composition, specifically the zinc content. As found by Harthill for Qianlong issues,³¹ there is often good correspondence between the prescribed composition of the coins and their actual analyses, provided that allowances are made for losses in manufacture. In 1683/4, to economise on copper, due to the high price of that metal, the alloy of the coins was altered from 70% copper: 30% zinc to 60% copper: 40% zinc.³² The higher zinc content corresponds closely with that observed for the 'middle' period and later coins after allowing for loss of zinc by evaporation during manufacture;³³ hence the 'middle' period coins were presumably issued from 1683/4. The changes in the trace element composition during the Kangxi period parallel those of the zinc and therefore also occur from 1683/4. This coincides with the resumption of trade with Japan as described above. During the Qianlong period, especially from Harthill's period G (from about 1781), the concentrations of Sb, As, Ni all increase and revert to levels typical of the period before 1683.

For comparison with the late 17th-century Chinese coins, the composition of relevant metal supplies is shown by contemporary Japanese ingots and coins and Chinese coins manufactured close to, and presumably using, local supplies of copper. Appendix 2 lists some analyses of mid-17th-century Japanese coins,³⁴ late 17th-century Japanese copper bar ingots³⁵ and previously unpublished data on cash coins from Yunnan, issued under Shunzhi in the period 1653–62.³⁶ The bar ingots were recovered from the Dutch vessel *Waddingsveen* which was wrecked in Table Bay, Cape Town in 1697. Although these similar ingots were en-route to Europe from Japan they are probably similar to the supplies sent to China. This small number of ingots cannot of course be taken to represent all the output of copper from Japan.

It can be seen from Appendix 2 that the Japanese copper, or copper alloys, in this period are generally characterised by relatively low levels of a number of trace elements, particularly antimony, arsenic and nickel, which corresponds closely with that of the Kangxi metropolitan mint coins after 1683 and up to the later years of Qianlong. The Chinese copper from Yunnan on the other hand has much higher levels of these elements, corresponding with the Kangxi issues before 1683 and the later issues of Qianlong. To conclude, changes in the coin compositions appear to follow the historical events and correspond closely with the available metal stocks thus supporting the view that the Chinese coinage over the period 1683 to 1781 may have been manufactured largely using copper from Japan.

A list of the coins and ingots analysed is given in Appendix 3.

[First published in *Numismatic Chronicle* 158 (1998), 185–96.]

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Joe Cribb (Coins and Medals, British Museum), Mari Ohnuki (Bank of Japan) and Duncan Hook and Paul Craddock (Scientific Research, British Museum) for their help in preparing this paper.

Metal Supply for the Metropolitan Coinage of the Kangxi Period (1662–1721)

Figure 1 Mean concentrations of zinc, tin and lead in coin groups listed in Appendix 1

Figure 2 Mean concentrations of antimony, arsenic and nickel in coin groups listed in Appendix 1

Notes

- 1 S.G.E. Bowman, M.R. Cowell and J. Cribb, 'Two thousand years of coinage in China: an analytical survey', *Journal of the Historical Metallurgy Society* 23 (1989), 25–30; Zhao Kuanghua, Zhou Weirong, Guo Baozhang, Xue Jie and Liu Junqi, 'An analysis and discussion of the chemical composition of copper coins of the Ming dynasty', *Studies in the History of Natural Sciences* 7 (1988), 54–65 (in Chinese); Dai Zhiqiang and Zhou Weirong, 'Studies on the alloy composition of past dynasties copper coins in China', in T. Hackens and G. Moucharte (eds), *Proceedings of the 11th International Numismatic Congress* (Brussels, 1993), 311–24.
- 2 M.R. Cowell, J. Cribb, S.G.E. Bowman and Y. Shashoua, 'The Chinese cash: composition and production' in M.M. Archibald and M.R. Cowell (eds), *Metallurgy in Numismatics* 3 (1993), 185–98.
- 3 All the issues from this period and later, analysed by Cowell and Bowman (Cowell *et al.*, 'The Chinese cash' and Zhou Weirong (Dai Zhiqiang and Zhou Weirong, 'Studies'), contain substantial amounts of zinc.
- 4 There is evidence from the *Ming Huidian* that the official use of brass commenced in 1553, Zhou Weirong and Fan Xiangxi, 'A study of the development of brass for coinage in China', *Bulletin of the Metals Museum* (Japan Institute of Metals) 20 (1993), 35–45, however brass coins were used before this.
- 5 For example in the sixth year of Qianlong, D. Harthill, 'A study of the metropolitan coinage of Qian Long, *Numismatic Chronicle* 151 (1991), 67–120.
- 6 For example, Bowman *et al*., 'Two thousand years'; Dai Zhiqiang and Zhou Weirong, 'Studies'; Zhou Weirong and Fan Xiangxi, 'A Study'.
- 7 For a description of the processes used for brass manufacture see P.T. Craddock, *Early Metal Mining and Production* (Edinburgh, 1995), 292–302.
- 8 See translation by E-Tu Zen Sun and Shion-Chuan Sun, *Chinese Technology in the 17th Century* (Pennsylvania Press, 1966), 165–69.
- 9 Cowell *et al.*, 'The Chinese cash'.
- 10 Zhou Weirong and Fan Xiangxi, 'Studies'.
- 11 It is generally recognised that the maximum zinc content which can be achieved in a brass produced by the cementation process is about 33%, assuming that the copper is finely granulated and contains no lead or tin. Any additional lead or tin, or subsequent alloying of the brass, will lower the maximum zinc content substantially and thus brass with more than 33% zinc must have been made by mixing metallic copper and zinc. See J. Day, *Bristol Brass: History of an Industry* (Newton Abbott, 1973) and M.B. Mitchiner, C. Mortimer and A.M. Pollard, 'The alloys of continental copper-base jetons (Nuremberg and medieval France excepted)', *Numismatic Chronicle* 148 (1988), 117–28.
- 12 The ingot, apparently one of many from this location, weighed 1 picul (133.3lb, about 60kg) and contained over 98% zinc with 'very small quantities of iron and lead'. See F. Browne, 'Early Chinese zinc', *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts* (correspondence) 54 (1916), 576. 13 Cowell *et al.*, 'The Chinese cash'.
-
- 14 This increased cadmium has been confirmed by other analyses, see Zhou Weirong, 'Application of zinc and cadmium for the dating and authentication of metal relics in ancient China', *Bulletin of the Metals Museum* 22 (1994), 16–21. However, the interpretation that this is concerned with the introduction of speltering, ie use of metallic zinc,

Cowell and Wang

is unlikely to be correct as other evidence (such as high zinc contents) indicates the use of metallic zinc before 1621.

- 15 The increase coincides with Harthill's phase G for the Qianlong coinage, from about 1782, Harthill, 'A study'.
- 16 K. Glamann, 'The Dutch East India Company's trade in Japanese copper, 1645–1736', *Scandinavian Economic History Review* 1 (1953), 41–79, especially 52–54. Taiwan was the centre of the Dutch trade with China and Japan; the Dutch East India Company factory at Nagasaki came under the administration of the factory in Taiwan, the key Dutch channel to Chinese markets. From 1661 Taiwan was also the base for Zheng Chenggong (Koxinga), of the anti-Manchu resistance, and remained under his family until 1680 when it was incorporated into the Chinese empire.
- 17 Glamann, 'The Dutch East India Company's trade', 72.
- 18 Glamann, 47.
- 19 Glamann.
- 20 Glamann notes that these were used '... mainly in the Toncquin trade'; Glamann, 50–51.
- 21 If 1 picul = 59.7kg, then $17,000-18,000$ piculs represent about 1,015–1,075 tonnes of copper. These early figures are not indicated in the Japanese table compiled by Atsushi Kobata, which implies that the first such exports by the Chinese took place in 1663; Atsushi Kobata, *Nihon dou kogyo shi no kenkyu* [Research on Japanese copper mines], (Tokyo, 1993).
- 22 Glamann, 76.
- 23 John Hall, 'Notes on the early Ch'ing copper trade with Japan', *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*12 (1949), 444–61, especially 451.
- 24 Glamann, 77.
- 25 Glamann, 75-78.
- 26 Hall, 'Notes', suggests over 100 Chinese ships entered Nagasaki.
- 27 Hall, 'Notes', 454.
- 28 P.T. Craddock and D.R. Hook, 'The British Museum collection of metal ingots from dated wrecks', in M. Redknap (ed.) *Artefacts from Wrecks* (Oxbow Monograph 84: Oxford, 1997), 143–54. 29 Cowell *et al.*, '*The Chinese cash*'.
- 30 W. Burger, *Ch'ing cash until 1735* (Taiwan, 1976).
- 31 Harthill, 'A study'.
- 32. Burger, *Ch'ing cash*, 67.
- 33 The losses were apparently as high as 25% relative (*Tian-gong kaiwu,* E-Tu Zen Sun and Shion-Chuan Sun, *Chinese Technology*) which would lead to a final concentration of about 33% zinc. However, judging by the composition of the coins the average zinc losses were probably nearer 15–20%.
- 34 Plasma spectrometry and neutron activation analyses by Y. Sano, K. Notsu and T. Tominaga, 'Studies on chemical composition of ancient coins by multivariate analysis', *Scientific Papers on Japanese Antiques and Art Crafts* 28 (1983), 44–58.
- 35 Inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectrometry analyses by Craddock and Hook, 'The British Museum collection'.
- 36 Analyses by energy dispersive X-ray fluorescence (XRF) on polished areas on the edge of each coin. For details of the technique used see M. Cowell, 'Coin analysis by energy dispersive x-ray fluorescence', A. Oddy and M.R. Cowell (eds), *Metallurgy in Numismatics* 4, (Royal Numismatic Society, Special Publication no.30, London 1998), 448–60.

Appendix 1

Selected analyses of Shunzhi, Kangxi, Yongzheng and Qianlong metropolitan mint cash coins

The coins are all illustrated on PIs 1–3

Precision and accuracy of X-ray fluorescence (XRF) and atomic absorption (AAS) analyses.

AAS, 1-2% for major elements (Zn, Sn, Pb), 5-20% for remainder depending on concentration.

XRF, 2-5% for major elements (Zn, Sn, Pb), 10-25% for remainder depending on concentration.

Appendix 2

Analyses of 17th-century Japanese and Chinese metalwork

The ingots and Chinese coins are illustrated on Pl. 4.

Chinese coins: Shunzhi, Yunnan mint (numbers refer to Plate)

Appendix 3

List of the coins and ingots analysed

Appendix *Chinese Coins: Alloy Composition and Metallurgical Research*

Chinese Coins: Alloy Composition and Metallurgical Research *is a new book by Zhou Weirong, published in Beijing (*Zhongguo gudai qianbi hejin chengfen yanjiu*, Beijing: Zhongghua shuju, 2004, ISBN 7-101-04089-6/H.195). It brings together the results of the metallurgical and numismatic research on Chinese coins undertaken by Zhou Weirong since 1985. In the largest metallurgical project on coins ever undertaken in China, he applied classical methods of chemical analysis (wet method) to over 2,000 Chinese coins from the 6th century* bc *to the early 20th century. The book presents the metallurgical data and illustrations of the specimens tested, and, most importantly, interprets the results by drawing together the metallurgical data, numismatic and textual evidence of the coins. In so doing, Zhou has tracked the development of the alloy composition in Chinese coin production, thereby showing the composition of Chinese coins through the ages, and also providing a unique survey of the evolution of metal alloys in China. He has also made a comprehensive investigation of the use of the minor elements in the alloys, such as iron, zinc, cobalt, nickel, cadmium, silver, gold, arsenic and antimony. The Introduction, Postscript and Contents of the book have been translated into English by Helen Wang, with the permission and approval of Zhou Weirong.*

Introduction by Zhou Weirong

Chinese coinage

Chinese coinage represents the eastern tradition of coinage, and is an important and influential branch of world coinage. There are two major characteristics of this tradition: first, that from their very beginning down to the late 19th century, Chinese coins were cast in moulds. Second, that bronze coins were the main form of currency. These two characteristics mark the eastern tradition of coinage as being very different from that of the west, where coins were typically struck with dies, and made of gold, silver and bronze.

Archaeologists have confirmed that bronze money was being cast in China as early as 600 bc. The bronze-casting site at Houma, Shanxi province, has yielded early hollow handle spades, moulds for making such spades, and bronze remains of the casting process. Other sites with early coin casting remains include Yan Xiadu (the lower capital of the Yan state) and sites of the Zhongshan state, all in Hebei province; the ancient city of the Qi state at Linzao in Shandong province; and the Zhenghan city site at Xinzheng in Henan province. However, the overall picture suggests that coinage in the pre-Qin period was not well controlled; the coins of the various states were different in form and manufacture, and the quantity of coinage was probably also rather small.

The unification of the various Warring States to form the Qin dynasty led to the unification of currency. With the rapid social and economic progress of the Han dynasty, Chinese coinage

entered its first stage of major development. According to historical records, between 114 BC– *c.* AD 1–5, a period of almost 120 years, the total number of coins cast officially by the Han court reached over 28,000,000,000. Furthermore, lead and iron coins have been unearthed in some parts of China, suggesting that these were produced in regions where bronze coins were in short supply. During the Wei, Jin and Northern and Southern Dynasties, great social upheaval and economic downturn rendered production and circulation of coinage very difficult.

The Tang dynasty brought a new social stability and a flourishing economy, and Chinese coinage entered its second major stage of development. The earlier coinage based on the *liang* and the *zhu* weights which had been in circulation for over 800 years was replaced with the new *tongbao* system. Records show that during the prosperous reign of the Tang emperor Xuanzong 'the ninety-nine furnaces under heaven' produced an annual output of 327 million coins.

Chinese coinage entered its third stage of major development during the Song dynasty, a period of great economic prosperity. The Song dynasty was a golden age of coin-casting, in terms of the enormous quantity of coins produced, their variety, the precision of the alloy composition, and the great technical skills employed. The *Songshi* [History of the Song dynasty] states that during the reign of the emperor Shengzong over 5,000 million bronze coins and over 880 million iron coins were produced.

The rise of paper money after the Song dynasty led to an overall decline in coin production, although the technical side remained of a high standard. In the late Qing dynasty, coinminting machinery was imported from the west, and the traditional Chinese cast coin was eventually replaced by the machine-struck copper dollar.

Numismatics in China

The study of ancient coins began as early as the 5th century in China, and by the mid-6th century, the first two numismatic books had been written: Liu Qian's *Qian zhi* and Gu Huan's *Qian pu*. Unfortunately, neither has survived in its original form, but only in the records of later numismatists. The Tang dynasty scholar Feng Yan compiled the *Xu qian pu* [An expansion of the *Qian pu*]. This contains the earliest record of the discovery and excavation of Eastern Zhou coinage (770–256 bc), along with some of the first attempts at their identification.

During the Song dynasty, the increased attention to excavated antiquities also stimulated an interest in coins among scholars such as Dong You, Hong Zun, Zheng Qiao and Luo Bi. The scripts on ancient coins were difficult to read, there were few books which they could consult, and this, combined with the Song fashion for myths and legends, gave rise to the creation of a number of fanciful appellations, relating to myths of early China: for example, *Huangdi huo* 'money of the Yellow

Zhou Weirong

Emperor', and *Shen Nong quan* 'coins of Shen Nong'. In the absence of scientific investigation, these terms persisted.

The great advance in numismatics came with the move to more factually based research in the Qing dynasty, especially from the Qianlong reign (1736–95) onwards. Books such as Chu Shangling's *Ji jin suo jian lu* [*Record of bronzes I have seen*] (1819) and Li Zuoxian's *Gu quan hui* [*Collection of ancient coins*] (1864), show a more serious and scholarly attitude towards the identification of ancient coins. They remain important reference works to this day, and are seen as the classics of traditional Chinese numismatics. In 1938, Ding Fubao published his epic work *Gu qian dacidian* [*Encyclopaedia of ancient coins*], in which he brought together the results of traditional Chinese numismatics. In 1940 the *Quanbi xueshe* [China Coin Society] was established in Shanghai, with its regular journal, *Quanbi* [*Coins*].

Although there was a substantial amount of research on Chinese coins between the 5th century and the first half of the 20th century, the focus was very clearly on collecting, and books on numismatics were largely written by and for collectors. Little, if any, attention, was paid to the information inherent in the coins themselves. For this reason, it is true to say that for the first 1,500 years, the study of Chinese coins did not break free from the bonds of the very traditional field of Chinese epigraphy, known as *jinshixue* 'the study of inscriptions on metal and stone'.

From the 1950s, however, scientific archaeology breathed new life into the subject. Not only did it provide a large quantity of reliable evidence from excavations, it also opened the eyes of the coin specialist to the fact that archaeological data attached to the coins could help solve difficult questions. From this point on, numismatics developed largely on the back of archaeology.

The late 1970s and early 1980s saw a renaissance of academic research in China, and an unprecedented development in numismatics. The China Numismatic Society was established in 1982, and its quarterly periodical *Zhongguo Qianbi/China Numismatics* was established in 1983. There are now over 30 numismatic journals in China and well over 100 specialist illustrated books devoted to Chinese numismatics. This rapid development in the subject is due to two factors: first, the results of field archaeology. Since the 1980s archaeological fieldwork, planned or preliminary to construction work, has brought a vast amount of information to the field. To date, about 100 coin-casting sites have been discovered, and millions of coins have been excavated. Second, the application of science and technology since the 1980s has, quite simply, revolutionised the field of Chinese numismatics.

Metallurgical studies of Chinese coins

The first metallurgical studies of Chinese coins were undertaken over 100 years ago by Dr Koga Yoshimasa of the Osaka Mint, who, in 1910 analysed 113 East Asian coins, of which 59 were Chinese.¹ By means of investigating the alloy composition of ancient coins he sought to establish a body of data to which he could refer when preparing the production of modern coins. A scientist rather than a numismatist, he opened up the way for metallurgical study of ancient coins.

In the early 1920s, the scientists Zhang Hongzhao and Wang Jin investigated the alloy composition of Chinese coins from the perspective of the history of metallurgy, and achieved some notable results. Taking the zinc content of coins of Wang Mang's reign and of the Song dynasty as a basis, Zhang Hongzhao then developed his views on the history of zinc in China, which in turn became a focal point in the metallurgical world.² Wang Jin was one of the first scholars to propose that the metal content of Chinese coins could be investigated and that the results could be applied to historical questions. Indeed, his article on *wuzhu* coins became a model example showing how metallurgical analysis could be combined with textual evidence as a means of examining historical questions.³ His discussion on the relationship between solder, lead and tin, and his explanation of the changes in the zinc content in coins are still valid. At the same time, Masumi Chikashige was making important headway as he studied the metal content of ancient coins as a means of investigating China's early coinage.

In the late 1920s and early 1930s, the Japanese scholars Kato Shigeshi and Dono Tsurumatsu took metallurgy in numismatics further, by means of their chemical analysis and metallographic study of the coins.⁴ However, there are limitations to the data they collected, and some of their points and conclusions still require further attention.⁵ The Chinese scholars Wu Chengluo and Shen Xiongqing were also engaging in similar work at that time.⁶

Between the 1940s and 1960s there was very little development. There was only occasional publication of any data, with the exception of two articles by Wang Jin, in which he applied the knowledge of the alloy composition of Chinese coins to the history of metallurgy in China.⁷

The 1970s saw developments in scientific instruments and apparatus, and in non-destructive methods and methods requiring smaller samples, such as EPMA, SEM, XRF, AAS and NAA, were used to analyse the metal content of coins. This opened the way for further work on the alloy composition of coins, and in the 1970s and 1980s the international worlds of archaeometry and history of science and technology published a large amount of data relating to the metal alloys used to make coins. Several hundreds of Chinese coins were tested, in particular by Japanese specialists working on antiquities and archaeology.⁸ Hower, the value of these results for further research was limited. Chinese coins were cast, using Cu-Pb-Sn or Cu-Pb (sometimes Cu-Sn) alloys, the composition of which was not always consistent, and many of the tests on Chinese coins did not yield precise or accurate enough results.

Before the 1980s, although scientific research had touched upon Chinese coins, only a small number of scientists had taken any interest in the results, and if the Chinese numismatic world noticed them at all, they had done nothing with them. The absence of mutual interest and co-operation meant that the scope and results of such analyses were limited. However, the situation changed drastically in the 1980s when Dai Zhiqiang, Zhao Kuanghua and Hua Jueming carried out more in-depth research on metal alloys.⁹ This co-operation marked a watershed. In the numismatic world, no longer was it sufficient to consider Chinese coins in the traditional ways. The impact was also felt in the broader academic world. As a scientist, I turned my attention to the alloy composition of coins, and used the results to carry out the first systematic studies of zinc smelting and brass in China.¹⁰ The results demonstrated the importance of bringing together the alloy composition of coins and the history of metallurgy. Those working in the diverse worlds of antiquities, museums, science and technology,

archaeology, numismatics and history of metallurgy sat up and took notice. Metallurgical analysis of coins began to take off in various places, and much of the data was published. Indeed, statistics show that by the end of 1989, over 800 coins had been tested as part of official and unofficial projects around China. It is worth pointing out that the most common method used for testing the coin alloy was the chemical quantitative method, that the results were largely accurate and reliable, and that they provided a sound foundation for further research into the alloy composition of coins.

In the 1990s came another breakthrough, as scientists and numismatists co-operated on a large project examining the alloy composition of Chinese coins. Before testing, all the coins were identified and authenticated by numismatists. The scientists then carried out the tests. The coins were then re-examined with the benefit of the results of the tests. Such interdiscplinary cooperation brought together the three areas of textual evidence, history of metallurgy and numismatics. The information in the historical texts was applied in the identification of the alloys, and the results of the tests were, in turn, applied back to the historical texts. The evidence was then examined from the perspectives of the history of metallurgy, the history of money, as well as numismatics. In testing the results of the metallurgical analysis against different disciplines, the results were themselves tested. This interdisclipinary approach has added immensely to their validity.

A new approach: combining old and new ways

The traditional way of appraising coins was essentially 'by eye', and involved no small amount of experience of handling genuine pieces along with a gradual accumulation of expert knowledge. Critical aspects included form, inscription, calligraphy, decoration, size, weight and patterns of corrosion. It was, in effect, an appraisal based on the external factors of the coin. There was no way of investigating the internal factors of the coin beyond surface level. Now, by applying new scientific methods, we can confirm both the external factors of a coin and its internal composition. By means of physical and chemical analysis we can determine the alloy composition of coins of different periods of history and of different forms, and by comparing the results we can trace the development of the metal alloys used in coin production through the ages. We can also pinpoint significant changes at different periods and in different locations. This adds an entirely new dimension to the identification and appraisal of coins. Not only does it open up a new field of study, thereby enriching the field of numismatics, it also helps us to gain a more comprehensive and more accurate

understanding of ancient coins, as well as providing a new stimulus for further research.

Of course, it is important both to continue to maintain the traditional ways and to bring together the traditional and modern scientific methods. Both are necessary and complementary, as one method cannot provide all the information offered by the other. In short, it is essential for scientists and numismatists to work together for a fuller and more accurate understanding.

Notes

- 1 Nippon Kyoto Teikoku Daigaku (Tokyo Imperial University), *Suiyo Kaishi*, vol.1, no. 8 (1911).
- 2 Wang Jin *et al.*, *Zhongguo Gudai Jinshu Huaxue ji Jin Danshu*, Shanghai: Zhongguo kexue tushu yiqi gongsi, 1995, 21–38.
- 3 Wang Jin *et al*., *Zhongguo Gudai Jinshu Huaxue*, 39–51.
- 4 Michino Shokaku, 'Kodai shina kahei no kagaku kenkyu', (in 2 parts), *Nihon Kakagu Kaishi* vol. 51 (1930), 463–73 and vol. 53 (1931), 100–9.
- 5 Kato Shigeshi (trans. by Wu Jie), *Zhongguo Jingji Shi Kaozheng*, Beijing: Shangwu shuguan, 1959, juan 1, 147–55.
- 6 Wu Chengluo, 'Zhongguo gu qian fenxi jieguo', *Huaxue Gongye* vol. 4, no. 2 (1929), 127–28. Shen Xiongqing, 'Zhongguo zhiqian zhi dingliang fenxi', *Huaxue Gongye* vol. 5, no. 1, 117–18.
- 7 Wang Jin and Yang Guoliang, 'Zhongguo gudai tong hejin huaxue chengfen bianqian zouxiang de yi ban', *Hangzhou Daxue Xuebao* 1959(5), 43–50. Wang Jin, 'Cong Ming Qing liang dai zhiqian huaxue chengfen de yanjiu tan zai gai shiqi zhong youse jinshu yelian jishu zai Zhongguo fazhan qingxing de yi ban', *Hangzhou Daxue Xuebao* 1959(5), 51–61.
- 8 Mizuno Masakatsu, 'Shinorishutsudo kosen kinzoku sosei', in Ichiritsu Hakodate hakubutsukan (Hakodate Municipal Museum) and Hakodate kyoiku i-inkai (Hakodate Education Committee), *Hakodate Shinori Kosen*, 1973. Mabuchi Hisao *et al.*, 'Toho kosen genshi kyushu koufuhou kagaku kenkyu', *Kyubunkazai no Kagaku*, vol. 22, juan 20 (1978), 20–23. Mabuchi Hisao *et al.*, 'Kodai kahei kagaku soshiki', *Nihon Kagaku kaishi*1979(5), 586–90.
- 9 Dai Zhiqiang, 'Bei Song tongqian jinshu chengfen chutan', *Zhongguo Qianbi*1985(3), 7–16. Zhao Kuanghua, Hua Jueming *et al*., 'Bei Song tongqian huaxue chengfen pouxi ji jia-xi-qian chutan', *Ziran Kexue Shi Yanjiu* vol. 5, no. 3 (1986), 229–346. Zhao Kuanghua, Hua Jueming *et al.*, 'Nan Song tongqian huaxue chengfen pouxi ji Songdai dantong zhiliang yanjiu', *Ziran Kexue Shi Yanjiu* vol. 5, no. 4 (1986), 321–30.
- Zhou Weirong's M.Sc. thesis 'Mingdai tongqian chengfen pouxi ji Mingdai huangtong yu jinshu xin yelian de lishi tantao', July 1987. Zhou Weirong, Zhao Kuanghua *et al.*, 'Mingdai tongqian huaxue chengfen pouxi', *Ziran Kexue Shi Yanjiu* vol. 7, no. 1 (1988), 54–65. Zhou Weirong, 'Woguo gudai huangtong zhuqian kaolüe', *Wenwu Chunqiu* 1992(2), 18–24. Zhou Weirong, 'Shui xi kao bian', *Wenwu Chunqiu* 1992(3), 57–61. Zhou Weirong and Fan Xiangxi, 'Zhongguo gudai huangtong zhuqian licheng yanjiu', in Zhao Lingyang and Feng Jinrong (eds) *Yazhou Keji yu Wenming* (Mingbao chubanshe, 1995). Zhou Weirong, 'Huangtong yezhu jishu zai Zhongguo de chansheng yu fazhan', *Gugong Xueshu Jikan* vol. 18, no. 1 (2000), 67–92.

Postscript by Dai Zhiqiang

In November 2002 a Metallurgy and Numismatics Conference was held in China. It celebrated the revolution that has been taking place in modern Chinese numismatics, bringing together numismatists and scientists.¹ The results of this co-operation have been phenomenal.

Although there has been close co-operation between the fields of metallurgy and numismatics in the West for over 100 years, it has taken much longer for such co-operation to become established in China. The earliest attempts took place in China in the 1920s, but numismatists did not embrace the results and scientists perhaps did not realise the vast reservoir of data that the coins could offer.

In September 1982, the Henan Archaeological Society organised a conference looking at Metals in Archaeology. As I was working in Anyang, Henan, at the time, and was Head of the China Numismatic Society, I prepared a paper on the metal content of Chinese coins. For reasons of convenience, I started with a group of Northern Song coins, asked Wang Tihong at the Luoyang Copper Works to analyse samples from the coins, and then wrote up the results.² The results were encouraging and showed how scientists could contribute to numismatics. It happened that Hua Jueming, Deputy Head of the History of Natural Sciences Research Centre, Chinese Academy of Sciences, and Professor Zhao Kuanghua of the Chemistry Department, Beijing University, were also beginnning to explore and analyse Chinese coins. In summer 1985 they set up a working group at the Centre to facilitate co-operation with colleagues working in antiquities and numismatics. In early 1986, I met with Hua Jueming at the State Bureau of Cultural Relics to discuss how we could develop a project looking at the alloy composition of Chinese coins. Since then, Zhao Kuanghua, Hua Jueming and I have worked closely together.

Hua Jueming retired in 1993, and in order to continue our co-operation, his assistant, Zhou Weirong (who was then a research student under Zhao Kuanghua) was transferred to the China Numismatic Museum. Since then, Zhou Weirong and I have worked together to develop metallurgy in numismatics as an increasingly stronger branch of study. As Director of the Museum, much of my time has been occupied with administrative matters. Zhou Weirong's efforts have ensured

that our collaboration has continued to fruition, and his hard work has been recognised in his promotion: in 1995 to Deputy Research Fellow, in 2000 to Research Fellow, and in 2001 he was selected by the State Council's Academic Committee as a Member of the Specialist Team on the History of Science and Technology.

This book brings together reliable and scientific data collected from over 2,000 coins, from the pre-Qin period down to the late Qing dynasty. It is important first-hand evidence for the study of coins, in particular the evolution and development of the alloys used in coin production. The specimen coins were carefully selected, mostly from excavation, though with a small number of coins from collections. Samples were taken and tested with care, with Zhou Weirong always present. The methods used were the chemical quantitative method and the classical chemical method. Occasionally other methods were used, and these are noted where appropriate in the book. The coins were then examined again, in the light of the scientific data. Where questions arose, the coins were retested. The process was constantly being improved. In the early stages, we had overlooked the need to take photographs or rubbings of the coins, so we corrected this oversight. At first, we tested only the main elements of the alloy, but after discussions with colleagues overseas, we realised the importance of testing the minor elements as well, as they also offer evidence relating to the date, mints, mines and sources of metals, as well as the technology used to manufacture the coins. In short, the minor elements are there for a reason.

This book brings together the data from the analysis and illustrations, but it goes much further than that in its interpretation of the results. It reveals the alloy composition of Chinese coins through the ages, and the characteristics of particular periods. It also offers a chronological survey of the development of metal alloys in China.

Notes

- 1 Dai Zhiqiang, 'Qianbixue he jinshu yezhu shi', *Zhongguo Qianbi* $2003(1), 5-7.$
- 2 Dai Zhiqiang and Wang Tihong, 'Bei Song tongqian jinshu chengfen shixi', *Zhongguo Qianbi* 1985(3), 7–16. [First published, with restricted circulation, in Henan in 1984.]

Contents

A.2.6 Yuan and Ming A.2.6.1 Yuan

A.2.6.2 Ming dynasty (early)

Metallurgical Analysis of Chinese Coins at the British Museum | 99

Part C: Interpretation of Results

C.1 Bronze coins

coins C.1.1 The alloy composition and characteristics of bronze coins C.1.1.1 Pre-Qin` C.1.1.1.1 Spade money - hollow-handle spades - pointed-foot spades and similar square-foot spades - square-foot spades - arched-foot spades - other spades C.1.1.1.2 Knife money - Yan knives - Qi knives - straight knives - other knives C.1.1.1.3 Ant-nose money C.1.1.1.4 Round coins - *yi hua - banliang* and *liangzao - yuanzi - ming yue* C.1.1.2 Qin and Han C.1.1.2.1 Qin *banliang* C.1.1.2.2 Han *banliang* C.1.1.2.3 Western Han *wuzhu* C.1.1.2.4 Wang Mang's coinage C.1.1.2.5 Eastern Han *wuzhu* C.1.1.3 Wei, Jin, and Northern and Southern Dynasties (Six Dynasties) C.1.1.4 Sui, Tang, Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms C.1.1.4.1 Sui C.1.1.4.2 Tang C.1.1.4.3Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms C.1.1.5 Song, Liao, Jin, Xi Xia C.1.1.5.1 Northern Song C.1.1.5.2 Southern Song C.1.1.5.3 Liao, Jin, Xi Xia C.1.1.6 Yuan and Ming C.1.1.6.1 Yuan C.1.1.6.2Ming dynasty (early) *C.1.2 The other elements of bronze coins and their significance* C.1.2.1 Iron

C.1.2.2 Zinc C.1.2.3 Silver and gold C.1.2.4 Nickel and cobalt C.1.2.5 Arsenic and antimony C.1.2.6 Other

C.1.3 An overview of the alloy composition and quality of bronze coins

- C.1.3.1 Tracing the development of the alloy composition of bronze coins
- C.1.3.2 Scientific understanding of bronze coins

C.2 Brass coins

- *C.2.1 The alloy composition and characteristics of brass coins*
- C.2.1.1 Ming
- C.2.1.2 Qing

C.2.2 The other elements of brass coins and their significance

- C.2.2.1 Iron
- C.2.2.2 Silver
- C.2.2.3 Nickel and cobalt
- C.2.2.4 Cadmium

C.2.3 An overview of the alloy composition and quality of brass

- C.2.3.1 Tracing the development of the alloy composition of brass coins
- C.2.3.2 Scientific understanding of brass coins
- C.2.3.2.1 The composition and properties of brass alloys
	- the composition of two-element brass alloy
	- the properties of two-element brass alloy
	- the effect of other elements in brass alloy composition - special brass alloys
- C.2.3.2.2 The quality of brass alloys
	- the proportion of zinc in brass coins
	- the effects of the lead and tin
	- an overview of the alloy composition and quality of brass coins
- C.2.3.2.3 The development of brass coin casting technology as seen from the alloy composition of brass coins

C.3 Other coins

C.3.1 Red-copper coins

- C.3.1.1 The origins and spread of red-copper coins
- C.3.1.2 The red-copper coins of Xinjiang
- C.3.1.3 The technology used in making red-copper coins

C.3.2 Iron coins

- C.3.2.1 The origins and spread of iron coins
- C.3.2.2 The composition of iron coins

C.3.3 Lead and tin coins

C.3.3.1 Lead coins C.3.3.2 Tin coins C.3.3.3 Lead and tin coins

Appendix 1: The programme for investigating the alloy composition of Chinese coins

Appendix 2: The methods used to test and evaluate Chinese coins

Appendix 3: The question of gold plated coins (jin bei qian) and fire-lacquered coins

Appendix 4: The alloy content of non-Chinese coins

Contents and abstract in English

Postscript